

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1876.

The Week.

EVERY one who looks over, as every good citizen at one time or other is forced to do, the reports of Congressional proceedings, knows how difficult it is to make out from day to day exactly what is being done. This is due, of course, in a great measure to the disconnected way in which business is conducted, no one bill or resolution being necessarily discussed continuously until it is disposed of. But there are other causes too. It may seem preposterous to say so, but we know of no absolutely accurate report of Congressional proceedings. The *Record* is supposed, of course, to be such a publication, but the practice of tampering with speeches has now been carried so far that it is not an uncommon thing (indeed, it has been done within the past week) for one member of Congress to taunt another with an anticipated diversity between what he is actually saying and what he will probably appear to have said when the record has been altered. This throws us back on the newspapers, and yet no newspaper in New York publishes anything more than a meagre abridgment of Congressional proceedings. These abridgments are by no means accurate, and even in such an important debate as that on the West Point Salary Appropriation Bill, the other day, it was almost impossible to make out from the press reports exactly what had been done. The theory prevalent twenty years ago, that the progress of modern civilization had carried us beyond the point at which it was important to know what Congress is about, is, we suppose, pretty well exploded now, and we beg leave to call the attention of the Associated Press—which is, we suppose, the source of all our woes on this head—to the subject.

The debate in the Senate on the payment of the 3.65 February interest of the District of Columbia bonds resulted in bringing that body to pretty much the same conclusion that the House had reached before—viz., that in some way the manufacture of 3.65s must be stopped. The resolution as finally adopted by the Senate provides that there shall be no further issue; that the total amount of bonds (covering claims outstanding and audited, convertible into bonds) shall not exceed \$15,000,000; that there shall be no increase "in the present amount of the total indebtedness of the District of Columbia"; that any one who shall "knowingly increase or aid or abet in increasing" this debt shall be punished by imprisonment (not to exceed ten years) and fine (not to exceed \$10,000). It abolishes the Board of Audit, directs a report of proceedings by it to the Commissioners, and provides against any construction of the resolution itself into a recognition of the liability of the United States for either principal or interest of any bonds issued on or since the 27th of January. With regard to the February interest (which had been defaulted on while the debate was in progress), the resolution provides that the District Commissioners shall transfer to the Treasurer of the United States the funds in their hands subject to this charge. Instead of the cumbersome phrases, "the Board of Audit" and "the Commissioners of the District of Columbia," it would have been simpler, though not perhaps so parliamentary, to have inserted wherever they occur the words "Boss Shepherd." It is extraordinary to reflect that within six months the Assistant Attorney-General of a great commercial State was obliged to resign his position because his superior officer insisted that these bonds were proper securities for savings-banks to invest the money of the poor in. The resolution has now been sent to a conference committee. Besides a Pinchback debate, and the passage of a bill to pay the *Alabama* claims awards already made, nothing else of importance has been done by the Senate.

The House has finally disposed of the one-term amendment by 144 to 106, two-thirds failing to vote in the affirmative, and has in great haste passed a bill repealing the Bankrupt Act by a vote of 186 to 57. The Judiciary Committee has reported the bill to reorganize the judiciary, the provisions of which we have discussed on another page. Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, tried to get the Democrats to vote on two specie resolutions, the first denying any authority in Congress to issue paper-money in time of peace, the second declaring that in any scheme of currency legislation redemption must be kept steadily in view. The House, however, refused to suspend the rules so as to allow their introduction. On motion of Mr. Pierce, of Massachusetts, a resolution was adopted directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to find out what the Executive Department has done about the connection of General Schenck with the Emma Mine and the Machado claim. Several new investigations have been ordered, and the Diplomatic Appropriation Bill discussed.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has received a long reply to certain enquiries put by its chairman to the State Department, which makes the position taken up by Mr. Fish, in his recent circular despatch inviting European powers to join this Government in bringing pressure to bear on Spain in relation to Cuba, seem more singular than ever. It says that in pursuance of an agreement entered into with the Government of Spain in February, 1871, the claims of American citizens, native and naturalized, on account of damage to property and illegal arrests or imprisonment or personal violence, are now before a mixed Commission provided for by the agreement, which is holding its session in Washington. One hundred and fifteen cases have been submitted to it, of which nine have been already decided in favor of the claimants, involving the sum of \$878,050, and fifty-eight cases are still before it. This being the case, it is extremely difficult to understand the necessity for the interference of Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Austria, and Italy. As to the extent to which American citizens in the island are guilty of slaveholding, Mr. Fish is unable to give much information, beyond suggesting that any American engaged in sugar-planting in Cuba is presumably a user of slave labor.

It is pleasant to see how frank and outspoken the leading politicians are getting to be as the Presidential campaign draws near. Ordinarily, as is well known, the business of politics does not train a man to the public exhibition of his private hopes, ambitions, fears, prejudices, and hates. As to the last, he is particularly trained from his earliest entrance upon the arena—his critics harshly say—to dissemble, to feign friendship with those whom he really detests, and to simulate hostility to those with whom he really divides the profits of statesmanship. That this is not always true may be seen from the frank and natural behavior, according to the Washington despatches, of all the leading Presidential candidates. As a natural man, each Presidential candidate must hate every other; but if politicians were always what they are accused of being, Grant, Bristow, and Conkling would just now be more than ever courteous and conciliatory to each other. So far is this from being the case that it is almost impossible for Grant to meet Bristow, or for Bristow to meet Conkling, without oaths and curses filling the air. The precise words used at these rencontres are not given, nor does it seem clear that any of them has as yet ended in a knock-down fight, but it is getting to that point very rapidly. Till within the past week or two, the quarrels have generally been between Grant and Bristow, on the subject of the whiskey indictments. The case of General Babcock, whose indictment has done a good deal to endear him to the Presi-

dent, is usually at the bottom of the quarrel, and the proceedings are of a stormy character. They almost always end in a total cessation of conversation, and the relations of the President and Secretary of the Treasury are such that it is almost impossible to conduct the public business at all. There is now a difficulty between Mr. Conkling and Mr. Bristow. On Thursday last, the Senator went to see the Secretary, as the reporter cautiously observes, on behalf of "an officer or employee" who "had been or was to be discharged" (a pretty safe statement as to the object of the visit), and the interview which ensued was so "furious" that the Senator said he would never enter the office of Mr. Bristow again. The reporter adds, rather enigmatically, that "the office-hours of the Department have been changed in consequence." What we like particularly about these quarrels is the manly openness which leads to the immediate communication of the facts to the press.

Mr. John Morrissey, the head of the Reform Democracy, has got a bill passed unanimously by the State Senate providing that all persons employed as laborers by this city shall receive a uniform rate of compensation, to be fixed from time to time by the Common Council, but not to exceed two dollars a day. As the act is purely declaratory, and has no sanction attached, there is no objection to its passage except the objection to humbug in general, and it will doubtless go through the House also by acclamation. We believe another bill is about to be or has been introduced making it a penal offence to pay more than the market rate for city labor, which will also pass, and so the good work of reform goes on. In the meantime, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Fitzjohn Porter's successor, is paying the market rate and no more, and no outcry has as yet arisen against him. The probable result of the whole affair will be the general substitution of contracts wherever possible for all other modes of doing city work. There does not seem to be any other way to meet the constant and growing tendency of the lazy, the vicious, and the improvident to live on the taxpayers. A few weeks ago, a candidate for the Legislature from one of the city districts met and was warmly greeted by a well-dressed man on Randall's Island, whom he recognized as one of his own inspectors of election, and found that, his "political duties" no longer requiring his attention, he had retired for the winter to the House of Refuge.

There has been a good deal of agitation for some weeks back over the privilege granted law-schools in this State to admit students to the bar without other tests of fitness than such as the schools themselves impose. These tests differ widely in different schools, and they all give their graduates considerable advantages, as regards time, over those who are admitted by examination in court after due service in a lawyer's office. The bar is now seeking to have the privilege withdrawn or modified, and the law-schools are offering a stout resistance before the Legislature, and one of them at least—that of Columbia College—with a good show of reason. But it is obvious that tests of admission to such professions as the bar, if they exist at all, ought to be uniform. Study in a law-school may fairly be allowed to take the place of service in an office, and might even be fairly exacted of all candidates for admission, but it is difficult to defend the removal from the jurisdiction of the bar or the courts of the process by which lawyers are made, and the relegation of the duty of passing on their fitness to professors whom the courts can neither appoint, remove, nor in any manner control, and who, though they may be excellent and conscientious in one school, may in another be inefficient and careless. To our minds, the proper use of a law-school would be the preparation of candidates for an examination by the courts, and the diligence and ability of professors in any particular school might be proclaimed by a system of marks and honors, which would not only glorify the school, but furnish a young man beginning practice a most useful and gratifying certificate of fitness.

The Granger movement has left in some of the Western constitutions, as a relic of its brief existence, a provision expressly recog-

nizing the right or duty of legislative regulation. This has been done, for instance, in Nebraska, one of the most undeveloped of all the Western States, and therefore most in need of railroads. The *Burlington Hawkeye* points out that even this assertion of an abstract right or duty is likely to prove objectionable, as it is held *in terrorem* over one class of enterprises and not over others. Such a constitution as that of Nebraska practically says to all kinds of trade and manufactures, "we want you to come to us," and at the same time warns the only kind of industry that can make trade and manufactures flourish that it comes at its peril. The dreadful agitation which possesses the Granger when he pictures to himself the extortionate profits of the railroads, is comical when we remember that, as a matter of fact, railroad-building is a precarious and unprofitable business, and the principal fear of the investor in railroads is lest he lose his entire capital.

In addition to other investigations this winter, Mr. John Jay, in a letter to the *Herald*, has put the Democrats on the scent of a new branch of the Vienna Exposition scandal. When the Senate investigated and vindicated Mr. Van Buren, they had before them, it is said, not the original evidence, but an abstract prepared by the State Department. Now, in regard to some important particulars, the abstract seems to have garbled the evidence. For instance, with regard to a payment of \$1,000 by a firm, the abstract says "it is not proven," when the official report, from which the abstract purports to have been made, says "\$1,000 is next proven to have been paid." Besides, much evidence is said to have been suppressed. Mr. Jay says that an unpleasant impression was created abroad by the appointment of Mr. Van Buren, after his suspension on account of the Vienna affair, to a consulship. This only shows how stupid the Austrians are. His suspension was the reason of his appointment, not an objection to it. If faithful men could have no offices because a newspaper clamor was got up whenever they became involved in a scandal, the Government could not go on for a week.

The events of the week tend to confirm the opinion before generally held by men in business, that there will be no important legislation at Washington this winter either in respect to financial or fiscal affairs. Merchants, therefore, are making their calculations on existing conditions, and even with these are looking forward to a more satisfactory business than they had last year. It is true that Secretary Bristow has been before Congress asking for authority to issue 4½ per cent. bonds to the amount of \$500,000,000—this to facilitate refunding operations; and that Dr. Linderman, Director of the United States Mint, has also urged that he be given authority to buy more silver bullion to coin. The latter officer supports his request by this argument: as silver bullion can now be bought at the lowest price ever known (\$1 03 per ounce 900 fine), the Government should buy it and pay it out at its "coining rate" or artificial value, \$1 24½, thereby making sixteen cents and four mills, less the cost of coining, which is not above two cents. Dr. Linderman does not point out that this is an unheard-of seigniorage for the Government to take, nor, what is important for the good name and good faith of the Government, that this silver coin would be worth less in gold than the fractional currency which it is proposed to redeem with it; that, in short, the plan, so far from bringing the currency nearer to a gold standard, absolutely does the reverse. And yet there are people who talk about this silver resumption as if it were part of a comprehensive plan to secure the payment by the United States Treasury of its notes according to original promise. In the money market, the rates for demand and time loans, as well as mercantile paper, have been lower, notwithstanding that there was a falling-off in the surplus reserve last week of \$700,000. At the Stock Exchange, there has been a lively speculation in shares, resulting at the end of the week in few changes of importance; investments have been in strong demand, and the gold market has been lifeless. Sterling

exchange during the greater part of the week was dull, but at the close became more active and strong, both on account of freer importations of United States bonds and because the price of cotton—our principal export—in Liverpool was so much below the price here that exports were checked and this source of bills momentarily dried up. The gold price of \$100 greenbacks ranged during the week between \$88 30 and \$88 69.

The *Tribune* has published its answer in the suit brought against it by Trenor W. Park, in which it repeats the story of the Emma Mine sale in London, with additional allegations, showing how Park kept secret the news of the collapse of the mine long enough to enable his confederates in London to sell out their stock. It further tells the story of the fraudulent sale of the Mariposa Mine, which is probably the worst transaction Park was ever engaged in, and the easiest to expose by proof, and also of his connection with the New York, Boston, and Montreal Railroad, which was a peculiarly disgraceful piece of business. In fact, Park's career has for many years been that of a mining and railroad speculator engaged in doubtful transactions, which gives a very comic air to Albert Grant's description of him in a recent letter as an eminent lawyer, and makes his offer to go into court about his character as a mining operator a piece of immense audacity.

Mr. Henry C. Bowen, in reply to "grievances" of a fellow-member of Plymouth Church, has sent a very rhetorical letter to the Examining Committee of that body, in which, after some rambling accounts of interviews, solicitations, and conversations, he says that years before the Tilton charges he had heard from "dear friends," presumably other members of the church, accusations against Mr. Beecher of "betraying the sanctity of home," but that he "never could or would be base enough to allow a single name to be bruited before the world," and he closes with a peroration in which he declares it to be his "unwavering opinion, in view of all the facts and evidence presented to him, that the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, without even the shadow of a doubt in his [my] mind, is guilty of the awful crimes of adultery, perjury, and hypocrisy." As nothing can be alleged with any certainty with regard to the state of the Brooklyn mind, it is just possible that this extraordinary epistle may have a certain weight as evidence. But in other parts of the country it will be remarked that Mr. Bowen's declaration in advance that he will never tell whose the homes were of which Mr. Beecher "betrayed the sanctity," makes this charge all but worthless; that Mr. Bowen's unwavering opinion on facts and evidence will have no weight with anybody, inasmuch as he has no reputation as either a judge or a logician; and that his declaration in the tripartite agreement, made fully and without reserve, that "he knew nothing which should prevent him from extending to him (Beecher) his most cordial friendship, confidence, and Christian fellowship," shows either that he uses the words "friendship, confidence, and Christian fellowship" in a sense peculiar to himself, or that he has been guilty of gross falsehood either in the present letter or in the tripartite agreement. But the precise points on which Mr. Bowen has gone astray will, we imagine, interest the public very little.

The "Letter Missive," by which Plymouth Church summons the Advisory Council, has been published. The points on which advice is sought are the propriety ("according to the Word of God") of the church's procedure in the matter of dropping members; the proper mode of dealing (1) with members who stay away from public worship because the church has not done certain things not affecting them personally which they think it ought to have done, but which they have never asked it to do, (2) with members who stay away because in like case the church has not done what they did ask it to do, (3) with members who absent themselves because they believe the pastor guilty of offences of which the church on investigation has pronounced him innocent, and (4) with members who have made gross charges against other members, but refuse to substantiate them;

whether the church ought to have called a Mutual Council to investigate the pastor, at the request of a member who has never made charges against him, and when such request is made a year after the church has investigated him; whether the church has acted properly in its dispute with Mrs. Moulton, and whether its general behavior is such as to entitle it to the confidence and fellowship of Congregational churches. It will be observed that the points are all fine, and need not, if well handled, carry the enquiry anywhere below the surface of things. We suggest, respectfully, a seventh point, which we think will make the enquiry full, final, and complete—viz., whether there is any truth in the charges made against the pastor in connection with Mrs. Tilton.

It appears certain that Count Andrassy's note, or the five principal points in it, will be accepted by the Turkish Government, but there is no present prospect that any special guarantees for execution will be exacted beyond supervision by a mixed commission of Christians and Mussulmans, which is in a measure exercised already by the consuls. The regulations for the organization and government of the Grand Council which the Sultan has decreed have been published, but they are very vague in character, and prove nothing except that the Council will be summoned, and will contain various high dignitaries, and will have great powers of investigation; but whether the investigations ever come to anything of course will depend on the general character of the civil service, which the Council will not control. The reorganization of the police service, which is also announced, is a more important matter, and promises to assimilate the police to that of Christian countries, with strictly defined powers as to arrest and detention. But it is doubtful whether any good police ever existed without a good public opinion to watch and check or stimulate it, and in the absence of this in Turkey new regulations are not likely to do much good. The January coupons have, contrary to the general expectation, been (half) paid.

The situation is likely to be still further complicated by the refusal of the Roumanian Principality to pay the customary annual tribute, which it defends by alleging that the consideration of the tribute is the promise of defence by the Porte against armed invasion. This pledge, it says, the Porte is now unable to fulfil, inasmuch as it is unable to put down one small insurrection in Herzegovina. The tribute is hardly worth fighting for, but the Sultan is extremely sensitive about anything which looks like a sign of decadence, and probably nothing but sheer weakness will prevent his trying to bring the Roumanians to reason by force. The air is, of course, full of rumors of outbreaks in other provinces and of fresh troubles with Montenegro; but rumors are in that part of Europe one of the chief weapons of rebels and their sympathizers. It may be taken for granted that the three Northern Powers, now that the Andrassy note has been accepted, will not allow the insurrection to spread further, or even run into the summer.

The news from Spain is, as usual, confused and contradictory, but in so far as anything positive can be detected in it, it seems to point to a somewhat rapid decline in the Carlist means of resistance. The weather is bad, and in the mountains this naturally delays and impedes the Alfonsists, but they are evidently better led and in better spirits than in any of the previous campaigns. There are wonderful stories of fraud and intimidation in the election of the Cortes, which probably mean that the Ministry have been "organizing" universal suffrage on the French plan, or, in other words, are determined to have a manageable assembly, and not a chaotic gathering such as poor Señor Castelar had to contend with. Of course the result will be a Cortes of creatures of the Government, like the Corps Législatif in France, but it will probably be as good a one as Spain in its present political and moral condition can supply. The peculiarity of the present state of the country is that any Government which proposes to stay in power has to be unscrupulous and high-handed.

"FIRST CHOICES" AND "FAVORITE SONS."

A LONG-ESTABLISHED usage has reserved the title of "Son" to candidates for the Presidency. As long as a man is simply a politician, with vague and indefinite aspirations, he is simply Mr. Smith of Indiana, or Mr. Jones of Illinois, but as soon as he begins to be positively spoken of as a candidate for the White House he becomes a "Son of Indiana" or a "Son of Illinois," as the case may be. The agitation among the Sons now begins to be great. Every State is producing a pair of them, one of whom the delegation in each of the party conventions will be bound to present as the "First Choice" and the "Favorite Son" of the State. As a general rule, no mention is made of a Son's personal appearance, either in praise or blame, though unpleasant allusions to his age or debility are not uncommon; but this year we seem likely to have in Mr. Conkling of New York a Son whose claims will be pushed on the ground of his physical beauty. Clubs for the advocacy of this gentleman's nomination have begun to spring up—mostly, it is true, in his own county—and we notice that in the speeches and articles which these organizations call forth, his great attractions of figure and feature are put in the forefront of the battle, showing that the female correspondent of the religious paper who dwelt on the "magnificence" of his "torso," and the fine shape and adjustment of his neck, had a true prescience of the main source of his political strength. There is, however, a certain vagueness in their description of his mind, though one local paper indirectly intimates that it is an instrument of extraordinary power and accuracy by declaring that his "conclusions are always correct."

The work of pushing the various Sons into prominence is, of course, going to furnish considerable interest and excitement to the professional managers from now until the conventions meet, and it is carried on with as much show of earnestness as if the public had no inkling or experience of its farcical character. There is something by no means complimentary to the popular intelligence both in the pains which some of them take to conceal, and in the pains which others of them take to avow, who is their "first choice," inasmuch as it implies in both cases that the first choice is a real man to whom they honestly and soberly mean to adhere. Mr. Kerr's chagrin, for instance, at having his letter published in which he pronounces Mr. Hendricks as his "first choice" and Indiana's "favorite Son," is something which, with all our respect for Mr. Kerr, we must pronounce a gross piece of affectation. Mr. Hendricks is, from our point of view, a very poor politician, whom we should be sorry to see in the Presidential chair, but as a "first choice" or a "Son" he is surely as good as anything in the field, and something of which nobody need feel ashamed. In fact, one of the peculiarities of "Sons" is that they bind nobody to anything, and reflect neither credit nor discredit on anybody.

In mentioning these "little games," however, what we wish to call attention to more particularly is that the utterances of the men and papers more immediately connected with the management of party machinery show little, if any, evidence of perception that there is any desire on the part of the public that things shall not go on in the old way; that a change of some kind is absolutely necessary; and that what the country is looking for, even if vaguely and blindly, is not a fresh batch of the old kind of Sons, but a complete change of system. For instance, it is only very rarely that in the discussion about the third term its opponents venture to remark, that even if a third term were allowable General Grant is not the kind of man for whom it would be well to establish the precedent; and yet this is by far the most important point in the controversy. It is of vastly more moment that the people should, after their experience of him, declare their unwillingness to leave the Government any longer in his hands, than that they should declare their unwillingness to allow any man to fill the Presidential chair for twelve years. There is, of course, a great deal to be said against the third term, but a movement to give a third term to a President who had reformed the civil administration, raised the standard of official honor and morality, magnified the value of knowledge and character in the public ser-

vice, and made an honest and successful stand against the hindrances to the control of the Government by public opinion now interposed by the political machinery, would be by no means an alarming sign of the times or a dangerous precedent. What is dangerous and alarming in the present crisis, if anything be, is that we are really threatened either with a continuance of General Grant or of the system on which he has administered the Government, in the person of some of his adherents. In other words, the first term of such a Son as Morton of Indiana, or Conkling of New York, would be for all practical purposes a third term; that is, it would have all the injurious effects on public life, and on political morals, and on the popular feeling about the Government, which the re-election of Grant would have. We confess that we, for our part, see far more danger to the Government in popular familiarity with or indifference to the evils which General Grant's Administration has fostered, than in the possibility of the election of any man for three terms. It must not be forgotten, in estimating or in criticising his political career, that it is the very fact of his strong claim on popular gratitude which has made his two terms so demoralizing, and it is almost always by men with claims on popular gratitude that the seeds of political ruin are sown. If he had not been a successful general in dark days, he would have become odious before 1872; but with the halo of the war about him, not only have a terrible number of faults been forgiven him, but they have come to lose the appearance of faults, and to take on that of virtues. No ordinary President could, for instance, have been allowed to give a Government like this a Mussulman flavor, by appointing high public functionaries through pure personal caprice. When President Grant first began to make extraordinary and, as it seemed, scandalous selections for places in the civil service, his friends maintained that we must not reproach him, that he was a simple-minded man, who was necessarily in this matter in the hands of the senators and representatives; but he speedily dissipated this theory by appointing Simmons of Boston in defiance of the representative of the district, and McDonald of St. Louis in defiance of the whole State delegation. In short, he has administered the Government neither on the old American "spoils" system nor on the new "civil-service reform" system, but on the Sultanic or Turkish system, which says, "I like Mustapha; put the Vizier's robes on him, and give anybody who says he is a thief one hundred blows with a stick."

Now, this system has sunk deep into the habits and ideas of the politicians who have during the last eight years surrounded the White House. What with their mode of maintaining order at the South, and their mode of distributing the offices at the North, and the strength of the President's prejudices and his audacity in gratifying them, and his love of reforming by semi-military *coups* rather than by steady adherence to rules, and his way of "sticking to his friends" through thick and thin, a considerable change has been effected both in their notions and in those of a large mass of their followers about the methods of constitutional government. They have contracted a reliance on force, on the individual will of the executive officer, an estimate of the importance of ends and of the insignificance of means, and a dislike of criticism and of investigation and of all change, which are far more dangerous to our political system than any third term can be. If these things get worked into the habits and morals of political life, a change will have taken place of a very serious character. The "Senatorial Group," as *Harper's Weekly* has happily designated it, which has stood by the President in all his false steps, and perhaps instigated a good many of them, is a dangerous body, which needs to be broken up and shorn of its power, and the Republican Convention will therefore only half satisfy popular expectation by refusing to renominate General Grant himself. It must not attempt to foist on us any of his "favorite choices," because we must somehow have an end to the system which, owing to his faults or his inexperience, has grown up about him. That a vigorous effort will be made to prepare the Convention for its perpetuation there is little doubt. The work of "subsoiling" is going on now. The "pre-primaries" have been held

long ago, and nothing but very strong and positive indications of popular sentiment will prevent the nomination of an Administration candidate. The bold declarations which we hear from some opponents of the third term, "that while entertaining the highest respect (or 'yielding to no man in respect') for General Grant," or, "while fully recognizing the value of his services to the Union, we must adhere to the unwritten law which limits, etc.," are all that the Group desire. They at once present you with a "First Choice" or a "Favorite Son," who positively is not General Grant, and has never served before in the Presidency; you can examine him for yourselves and see whether they lie; nevertheless, if you elect him, you vote to continue the Grant system, which may be described, in one sentence, as a system which encourages corruption by its normal action and represses it by occasional bursts of rage.

THE PROPOSED FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM.

THE "Bill to reorganize the Judiciary of the United States," prepared, it is understood, by Mr. McCrary with the approval of the judges of the Supreme Court, is designed to remove a crying evil which was pointed out by the *Nation* as long ago as October, 1872 (No. 383). Commenting then upon the almost imbecile attempts of Congress to reform the evils in the Federal Courts, we said: "It is obvious that Congress should have merged the district and circuit courts, and united the district judges of each circuit into a court of review. Requiring them to hold court in each State of their circuit, prohibiting the judge who tried the case from sitting to review it, and paying them liberally for their expenses, would have made each circuit much like one of the courts of Westminster Hall; while the occasional presence of a judge of the Supreme Court would have tended toward the uniform action of all." The passages italicized above almost completely define the general principles of the new bill. The circuit and district courts are practically merged by establishing a circuit "at the same time and place at which a district court shall or may be held," and by taking away the present appellate jurisdiction of the circuit courts, except in bankruptcy proceedings. A final appeal from the new court of review lies to the Supreme Court, but it is restricted to cases above \$10,000, and to cases involving a construction of the Constitution, of a treaty, or of a "law of the United States." There is also a saving clause, "when the court shall certify that the adjudication involves a legal question of sufficient importance to require that the final decision thereof should be made by the Supreme Court."

For some years the Supreme Court has been drifting steadily, and of late rapidly, into what may be termed a condition of official bankruptcy. It has not been able to pay off its obligations of duty, and adjourn owing nothing to its suitors. The obligations, too, are accumulating more rapidly than the payments can be made, so that, if things go on as they are going, it is absolutely certain that instead of being a "fountain of justice," the court will become a grand barrier to legal redress. At the beginning of the present term there were 666 cases upon the docket; at this time there are upward of 900. In less than twelve years it has published twenty-one volumes of reports; and, without disrespect, it must be said that no inconsiderable portion of these volumes is for the legal profession so much worthless matter, the decisions dealing with the facts of the case, the questions being of no earthly interest to anybody but the particular John Doe and Richard Roe who were contesting them, and the cases being of a kind that should never have found their way to a tribunal charged with the final determination of graver questions than were ever before confided to a court. It must also be said that too many of the important decisions have been unsatisfactory to the bar, the court treating legal subjects in a hasty manner, not going down "to the bottom of a case," and failing in that comprehensive generalization of principles which sheds light upon other cases and forestalls needless litigation. Notably, too, the court has fallen off from the patient research that made the opinions of Story a valuable repository of legal learning, and from the careful reasoning with which

Marshall built up the structure of his decisions. There has been too much of that dangerous and superficial element called *ipse dixit*—"we think this"—"we are of opinion that"—without the court designating the principle upon which it acts. Such decisions dispose of cases but shed no light upon the disposition of future cases. They also create uncertainty, which is the great source of appeals. But beyond this it is the cardinal principle of our Anglo-Saxon system of jurisprudence that our judges shall be men who can render a reason for what they decide. The integrity of our judicial decisions rests upon an honest statement of every case, and a clear exposition of the principles supposed to govern it. Our matters of jurisprudence are not confided to an Eastern kadi to decide as to him may seem best. We of the Anglo-Saxon stock have been for centuries striving to make the law a science which can be intelligently understood and rationally administered. Under our system a judge has no more right to state the facts of a case and say, "The plaintiff should have judgment, because I think so," than an astronomer to say, "It is 95,000,000 miles to the sun, because I think so." The theory according to which English and American jurisprudence has endeavored to proceed is that a decision shall be a demonstration. When the moral sense of the American bar allows our courts to render final decisions on the crude conclusions of the judges without an exposition of the processes by which the conclusions were reached, and through which alone we can determine whether they be right or wrong, it will be a long stride toward committing matters to individual discretion and abandoning the scientific generalizations of the law. The Supreme Court has also fallen into the way of deciding cases upon points which have never been argued. A court not overlaid with waiting cases could order a reargument; but with its immense and ever-growing docket behind it, our court of last resort cannot afford to give its suitors two days in court. Every lawyer knows what this means, and what a sense of injustice it generally arouses, and how ill able a judge is to decide upon the soundness of a point when the point is his own. Finally, there are too many "ear-marks" in these twenty-one volumes of too great haste in deciding, of rules laid down in one case without due reflection as to how they will affect a thousand transactions, of conclusions pronounced one year which the court was obliged to take back the next.

It is therefore not surprising that this bill to reorganize the judiciary of the United States is primarily a bill to relieve the Supreme Court. There is no doubt that it ought to pass; no doubt indeed that some such measure ought to have been passed long ago. The former legislation to relieve the judges partially from circuit duty has proved even more incommensurate with the difficulties of the situation than we predicted; for the chief evil, singularly anomalous though it be, was retained. So long as suitors in the circuit and district courts have substantially but one court to appeal to, just so long that one court will be overwhelmed with all the appealable cases of the Federal tribunals. It is absolute ignorance of the American character to suppose that the average suitor will surrender, if he believes himself in the right, on the decision of any one man. When a second tribunal composed of a number of judges decides against him he will ordinarily confess himself mistaken, lay the blame on the law, and give up the contest. But it is a folly which none but a member of Congress could be guilty of to suppose that in this country the court of first resort would be made voluntarily the court of last resort. This vast mass of cases has gone to the Supreme Court *ex necessitate rei*, because Congress provided no other appellate tribunal where they might go.

Appreciating and commending what might be termed the motive of this measure, we must nevertheless object to two of its provisions. The \$10,000 restriction on appeals is an enormous advance in a very bad direction. It practically makes the Supreme Court a tribunal exclusively for wealthy litigants. All of our traditions, American and English, and our sense of justice and our theory of legal rights, are opposed to a restriction which will close the doors of any court to ninety-nine in a hundred citizens. The

problem must be to keep out petty litigation, but not to keep out poor suitors. When we read in every English newspaper of actions brought before the Superior Courts of Westminster wherein the damages are laid at not more than £50, we cannot avoid thinking that the Judiciary Committee of the House has travelled a long way from the old idea that all men are equal before the law.

We must also object to the provision which allows the right of appeal to be dependent upon the discretion of the tribunal whose judgment is to be reviewed. The less we have of discretion in our American jurisprudence, and the more closely legal rights are measured by fixed rules, the better both for the judiciary and the citizen. The less, too, that the administration of justice depends upon the skill, or ability, or personal influence of the advocate, the more certain and honest and cheap it will be. If a case be represented by very eminent counsel, it will be found "of sufficient importance to require that the final decision thereof should be made by the Supreme Court"; if it be represented by the young or undistinguished lawyer, the judges will shake their heads and say "the public welfare requires that there be an end of litigation." The only sound criterion to be applied to any such class of appeals is that of a divided court. "Of sufficient importance" sounds well in a bill, but means nothing. Of sufficient importance to whom—the plaintiff, the defendant, the public, the profession, the learned counsel, or the court which wishes to be reviewed? Of sufficient importance in what—the amount, the principle, the effect on other cases, the intricacy or novelty of the questions involved? In short, these two words constitute one of those openings through which, as a learned judge once said, "a man might drive a yoke of oxen." On the other hand, if the members of a Circuit Court of Appeals were to stand three to two and the judge of the Supreme Court and the circuit judge formed the minority, could there be any propriety in allowing the right of appeal from such a decision to depend upon the discretion of the three district judges?

Some opposition to the bill, we are informed, is likely to arise, coming from an unexpected source—the judges of the already overworked circuits. Having already more to do than they can perform, they are opposed to new duties which must inevitably retard the existing administration of justice in their courts. And this suggests a defect in the bill as being too exclusively designed for the relief of the Supreme Court. We have in the United States districts where there is not two months' court work during the year; and, again, districts where there may be said to be thirty-six months' work to be disposed of in a year. The "penny-wise, pound-foolish" parsimony of Congress has shrunk from sending the idle judges to help the overworked and paying their expenses. Before the bill gets through Congress there should be engrafted upon it a comprehensive and liberal provision to this effect; for it is in the highest degree desirable that the new system be well balanced at the outset, and that in relieving the Supreme Court it do not erect a new dam farther up the stream.

To us Americans the judiciary is relatively a more important element of government than the judiciary of any other people can be to them. Yet does any one know what the Federal judiciary costs? It costs less than our light-house keepers; less than our diplomatic service; less than the "salary-grab." The annual pay of members of Congress would support the judiciary for four years. If the pay of every soldier during the war had been docked only a dollar a year, it would have been more than sufficient to carry on the judicial branch of the Government. All of the salaries of the United States judges, clerks, marshals, district-attorneys, and reporters cost the people of the United States about one cent for each inhabitant. Yet there are demagogues possessed of so little intelligence themselves that they really suppose the intelligent portion of the people prefer, for economy's sake, a weak and defective judicial system, which must directly and indirectly occasion delay, uncertainty, business derangements, insolvency, and that demoralization which cannot be measured in money.

ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION.

IN due course, after having become familiar, through literature, in England, our spelling-bees have at last been practically introduced there, and are contributing to while away the long winter evenings. Reports of them have appeared in the newspapers; these reports have given rise to comments by correspondents; and, in culmination, editorial dignity itself has condescended to mount the oracular tripod in the interests of spelling and pronunciation. Some of the results, in the way of facts and opinions, which have consequently emerged into publicity, are instructive, and some of them are not void of amusement. As to the facts, we learn, for instance, that, at least in select circles, Walker guides our English contemporaries on questions of orthography, just as he guided our grandfathers. Among the statements which the newly-imported diversion has educaed, one is that, out of every ten educated Londoners, nine say *peninsular* instead of *peninsula*, and similarly append *r* to all words ending in *a*. To this assertion, however, a self-complacent Scotchman insists on an amendment by declaring that the style of barbarism thus exemplified is all but as widespread as our very language. For so saying we may, no doubt, give him credit for correct information as regards the elocution of rather numerous low cockneys; but the remaining basis of his induction he has simply supplied by conjecture. More especially his own compatriots, he seems to think, constitute, from among all who have to do with English, the sole homogeneous body of articulate men which does not herein offend. Another position of his is even more hardy than this, and, indeed, grazes the heroic very nearly. He asks us to believe nothing less than that "a Scotticism is not necessarily a vulgarism, while an Anglicism is." To reckon up and formalize the swarming corollaries which logically attach to this humiliating proposition would call for more space than we can consent to spare. Keeping to pronunciation, it is demanded of us, according to this, to admit that an Englishman's way of disposing the accents, etc., of his mother-tongue is coarse and ignoble so long as North Britons—people speaking largely only a dialect of English—abstain from ratifying it. *Advertise*, as not having supplanted, in Scotland, the old-fashioned *advertise*—its *i* turned into the rustic *ai*, withal—must needs be plebeian; and so must be *committee*, instead of *em'mittes* or *committée*, which Englishmen have long abandoned, but which Scotchmen are pleased to patronize still. On another interpretation of the dictum just quoted, there is an innate elegance in Scotchmen which forbids that they should originate, in speech, anything unquestionably vulgar, whereas miserable South Britons, owing to their unfortunate organization and unhappy instinct, are, on the contrary, never led to devise any form of utterance which is not vulgar intrinsically. The author of the cruel and depressing maxim on which we are remarking laid his account, we may sarmise, to kindle an outburst of British wrath and reclamation which it might be hard for even a Scotchman to stand up against. It must be disappointing to him that he has only been laughed at. That an Englishman should not be more likely than any one else to utter aright his own native speech is naturally placed by his answerers on a par with the contention that the sum of two and two is not four. There remains to add that, abstraction made of the misaccentuation of a few well-known words, and of the mismanagement of the aspirate, Englishmen are, as a rule, exceedingly tolerant as to the pronunciation of our language. The reason of this, or one of the reasons, may be possibly that, with rare exceptions, all the energy which they choose to spare consciously in connection with the niceties of vocalism is exhausted in mastering the longs and shorts of Latin and Greek.

Not many months ago, one of our correspondents spoke of the words *glass*, *lust*, and *pastor* as perilously near being vulgarisms if sounded with their *a* like that in *father*. The late Mr. B. H. Smart, an orthoepist of the highest authority, had gone even further than this in referring *ass*, so uttered, to "a vulgar mouth." At the time this was his judgment he named the *a* of *at*, prolonged, as furnishing the proper vowel-sound in *ass*; but he is quoted as having subsequently written: "It is no longer affectation to say *ass*; and *grünt*, *gräft*, etc., at present indicate the pronunciation of well-educated London people under sixty-five or sixty years of age." It is interesting to hear what Mr. Alexander J. Ellis has to say on this head. In a letter to the London *Daily News*, he states that "the words *ass*, *pass*, *path*, *staff*, etc., have each six different pronunciations, each of which would pass muster before the most fastidious audience; but *gas* has only one," etc., etc. This averment, the truth of which it might be hazardous to doubt, strikingly corroborates the conclusion we have come to, that, in regard to pronunciation, Englishmen, within defined limits, some of them rather capricious, are, for the most part, ready to allow a very liberal margin of choice.

Dealing in generalities, Mr. Ellis ventures the opinion that there "is no

existing standard of the pronunciation of any literary language." He continues: "The distinction *literary* must be strongly insisted on. A literary language is entirely artificial. It never has been spoken naturally, although it is generally founded on the governmental or ecclesiastical predominance of some local habits." In passing, while there can be no question that the jejune articulations of an unlettered boor are, just as much as the elaborate rhetoric of a Johnson or a Gibbon, acquired, we wish that even every one given to "rushing into newspapers," as Mr. Ellis puts it, could be compelled to peruse and ponder Mr. J. S. Mill's criticism on "Nature" in his "Three Essays on Religion." Quite possibly, as a consequence, we should have less of unmeaning talk about language "spoken naturally," a language "entirely artificial," and the like, than now helps to dilate the pages and becloud the brains of conventionally nebulous thinkers.

To say "there is no existing standard of the pronunciation of any literary language" is a statement of that description which we ought not to expect from one who, like Mr. Ellis, acknowledges that the letter *r* "has engaged his attention for more than thirty years," and who, therefore, must presumably have reflected much on language. The real facts of the case are, we conceive, as follows: Take English for an example. Subject, as everything else is, to the law of intermittent change, it has no more absolute fixity than that which may be predicated of the present moment. Without cessation, it evolves or borrows new expressions, drops or modifies old ones, and ousts established senses of words in favor of others, or else accumulates the latter on the former. Further, that which obtains touching words obtains, and often as inexplicably, touching their pronunciation. But few lines of Shakspeare, as they came out of Shakspeare's mouth, would be immediately understood by a modern audience. This we know for certain; and yet science owns itself baffled when challenged to render a reason for so seemingly strange a phenomenon. Even now, when we adopt a word from the French, it does not at all follow, any more than it ever did, that we accept it to the ear as well as to the eye precisely as we found it. Then, as to terms from the Latin, Greek, etc., every generation shifts the accents of a number of them, generally to the producing of increased uniformity. Still, the words thus altered in enunciation are never very many within the compass of any one man's conscious experience. We repeat, that a strict parallel to what any one personally observes regarding the changes in our vocabulary, one observes as concerns pronunciation. In order to stereotype either of them in permanence, the human mind must first come to a complete deadlock. Room for option, alike in the one and in the other, there must, further, be to some extent, until we all get into and keep within one and the same groove of associations, enlightenment, and taste; a consummation awaiting what our far-off forefathers quaintly designated as nevermass. Why we demur to the precept that "there is no existing standard of the pronunciation of any literary language" will now be patent. Of literary English there undoubtedly is a standard of pronunciation, or, rather, as near an approach to a standard as seems attainable. However, in the estimation of Mr. Ellis, not only there is none, but, "in fact, there is no such thing as educated English pronunciation. There are pronunciations of English people more or less educated in a multitude of other things, but not in pronunciation."

Conformity with the pronunciation of the educated is not, then, good enough for our theorist. And so the secret at last is out, revealing to us a reminder of that visionary order which holds that the right and the wrong in the province of language is not determinable by good usage. Such wildness as this we emphatically protest against. Among the legitimate functions of a lexicographer are those of collecting genuine words, of defining them as in use, of tracing their etymology, and of spelling them as they are spelled after the consensus of the most intelligent writers. And no less the main service appropriate to an orthoepist is that of a mere explorer and recorder, that of ascertaining and registering the pronunciation which is agreed upon by a majority of the most cultivated speaker. Let the orthoepist additionally speculate on ideal improvements, by all means, if he will; but, inasmuch as the English-speaking peoples, at their best, are not barbarians, if, ignoring the actual and blind to all but theory, he says that "there is no such thing as educated English pronunciation," he might as well say that educated Englishmen and Americans are as yet non-existent. Right pronunciation is one of those things which are best acquired by unconscious imitation of one's right-pronouncing constant associates; and it is rarely acquired in any perfection otherwise. Place a ploughboy among lads of a higher social grade than his own, and keep him there, and he will sooner or later pronounce as they do. If, however, instead of being confined strictly to such companionship, he goes on herding with other ploughboys, no inculcation of rules, though ever so diligent, will avail to work much improvement in him as a pronouncer.

Nor, since it leads up to a part of our conclusion, is the giving expression to a fact so obvious as this entirely needless. On the one hand, orthoepy, being considered, and rightly, as an attribute of thorough culture, should be studied privately by grown-up people whose bygone neglect requires it, and should in schools be taught professionally, if only to counteract the contamination of prevailing bad example. On the other hand, it behoves those who offer to teach orthoepy to deal honestly by their subject, and to teach real orthoepy. Not unusually, we suspect, if not universally, their own predilections and private fancies are, as to this, that, and the other, the sole foundation of what they put forth as unoptionally correct. As a sample of what we mean, Mr. B. H. Smart directs that the *h* of *wheat*, *which*, *whip*, etc., should be sounded; and he had endless vexation about these words with his pupils as a matter of course, for it may be doubted whether he ever heard them without the *h* silent from any Englishman whatever, high or low, who was unaffected by Scotch or other un-English influences.

We have contended that there is a standard of English pronunciation. As an existing thing, it must have a local habitation; and this there is no difficulty in discovering. Should any one demonstrate that London is not the grand focus of civilization of us who speak English, it will then be time to seek for the standard of our language, and of the way to pronounce it, somewhere else. In no other one spot are so many educated English-speaking persons permanently congregated; and in no other one spot are the fruits of the varied learning dispensed by the great universities of Oxford and Cambridge so numerous represented. Nor is this all, or near it. We have there, more specifically, the headquarters of Great Britain, literary, scientific, legal, ecclesiastical, military, legislative, aulic. Each of the groups here enumerated has, doubtless, for occasional use, its minor professionalisms of speech; each, however, bearing with any of the others, when these professionalisms escape involuntarily or are obtruded wittingly. But essentially they all agree at any given time, and their general agreement is a thing which an attentive observer may make out with very little pains. Such an observer will soon satisfy himself, also, that a certain scope is left for choice of pronunciation, and that nothing but unmitigated vulgarity of utterance is thought to warrant injurious impressions. An ancient gentleman is not blamed for keeping up the *bale'ny*, *gould*, and *obleege*, which he learnt seventy years ago. An Oxford man and a Cambridge man will say, respectively, *nilther* and *neether*, the one to the other, perhaps unaware that they do so; and bystanders, if they notice the difference, and are questioned on it, will allow that both are right enough, and so will the contrariant pronouncers themselves. An uncompromising college don, to whom classical syllabic quantity is as sacred as the Thirty-nine Articles, will signify his profound erudition by his *medic'nal* and *Alexandria*, varied with *Ohio* and *Pofomac*, and his hearers are not appreciably aggrieved. An affected guardsman drops all his *r*'s, and no one, even mentally, proposes to pick them up and beg him to utilize them. A nobleman pronounces *volcano* with the so-called Italian *a*, and he may therein consult his pleasure, though he finds no imitators. Yet, in one respect all Englishmen harmonize as speakers. We refer to their tone of voice; and this, we apprehend, no adult foreigner can ever school himself into, or can so much as mimic successfully.

To sum the matter up, pronunciation, provided one avoids that of the confessedly illiterate, is an affair of only subordinate importance. Perpetually undergoing mutation, and its fashions not being so readily transmissible as the changes in written language, no one living at a distance from the centre where it is determined should be severely censured if ignorant of its present standard. Viewed rationally, it is the most ephemeral of modes; and, under any but an historical aspect, as between the decisions of veracious professors of it, those which were given last year may be of no more value, in comparison with those given this year, than a superannuated almanac. Excessive anxiety, or a habit of finical and superpunctilious exactingness, as with reference to dress, so with reference to pronunciation, is, moreover, an unfailing index of frivolity and little-mindedness. For the rest, nowhere on earth, we suppose, is correct pronunciation necessarily a concomitant of good breeding, except in so far as good breeding is assumed to include good education. A different opinion has, of late, been industriously promulgated; but we submit that it stands on much the same footing with the transcendental notion that the essence of gentlemanhood is wholly irrespective of both knowledge and morality. Pronounce as a man may, at any rate let his attitude towards pronunciation be that of common sense, and free from an inflated egotism. Whether we exert ourselves, or do not, to follow the English in their utterance of the language which we share with them, we shall, most assuredly, do well in deferring to their example

of good-natured tolerance of those whose elocution is not exactly to their own liking, and of checking a disposition, if it should arise, to draw censorious deductions from peculiarities which may, perhaps, be more than compensated by merits we can ourselves make no pretension to.

Notes.

A. S. BARNES & CO. will publish 'The Battles of the Revolution,' by A. General Carrington; and a reprint of 'Principles and Acts of the Revolution,' by Hezekiah Niles, famous in our political history as the editor of *Niles's Register*. The work has been thoroughly revised and chronologically arranged, with a classification of the contents under the respective colonies, by his grandson, Samuel V. Niles.—Mr. James E. Munson, 34 Park Row, announces that on March 1 he will begin the publication of a semi-monthly *Phonographic News*. Each number will contain eight medium octavo pages, all (except the title-page) printed entirely in phonographic characters, reproduced by the *Graphic* process from short-hand manuscript written by the editor. The reading matter will be adapted both to beginners and to experienced writers of short-hand.—The *Publishers' Weekly* for Jan. 29 contains a new and useful kind of advertisement, showing the number and titles of all the works issued by any given house in 1875. Another year we may hope to see the representation more complete, and some discrimination made typographically between home products and foreign reprints.—*Bulletin* No. 36 of the Boston Public Library (Jan., 1876) continues its suggestions for Centennial reading under the head of "Literature of 1776," with the sub-headings: In general; the Canada expeditions; Fort Moultrie, Sullivan's Island; Independence declared; Battle of Long Island; New York, White Plains, Fort Washington; Arnold on Lake Champlain; Retreat through the Jerseys, Trenton, Princeton; naval operations. It also contains a very full bibliography of music, and the beginning of an important "Check List for American Local History" (Abington—Boston).—The American series of A. B. Auerbach, Stuttgart, which we have already described as in progress, now embraces a translation of Franklin's Autobiography ('Benjamin Franklin: sein Leben, von ihm selbst geschrieben'), with a preface by Berthold Auerbach and an historic-political introduction by Dr. Friedrich Kapp, who gives a general sketch of the whole of Franklin's career. He finds a physical and psychological resemblance between the author of 'Poor Richard' and the Westphalian folk, or the Mecklenburgers whose homely wit and wisdom Fritz Reuter has made familiar to us in their Plattdeutsch dialect. Mr. Kapp instances as quite Franklinesque the remark of one of these about a neighboring advocate whose reputation was unsavory; "He is an honorable and worthy man, my boy, but you could not prove it on him"—a form of libel for which Mr. T. W. Park would perhaps not seek to recover damages.—Dr. Kapp, we may notice by the way, contributes to the January number of the *Deutsche Rundschau* an interesting article on the "Centennial Celebration of the American Declaration of Independence," in which he enumerates the reasons why Americans may revert with pride and gratitude to July 4, 1776. The *Rundschau*, we are informed, has a circulation in this country of not less than 800 copies.—In our review of the historical literature of 1875 last week we neglected to speak of Maspero's 'Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient,' which would seem to be the best and most recent statement of the results of scholarship in this field.—J. B. Lippincott & Co. have in press a 'History of the Philadelphia Brigade' (69th, 71st, 72d, and 106th Reg. Penn. Vols.), by Chas. H. Banes; and 'Centennial and Other Poems,' by R. S. Pollard.

—The fiftieth annual report of the President carries the history of Harvard College along another year, and the appended report of the Dean gives a number of statistics showing the effect upon the class of 1875 of their release during the senior year from enforced attendance upon college exercises other than morning prayers and examinations. The Dean sums up the result briefly by saying "that the average number of absences from recitations was between two and three times as great as it would have been under the system of enforced attendance, and that the influence of the change upon the average scholarship of the class was imperceptible either for good or evil." "Of the students, forming just one-half of the class, who obtained 75 per cent. or more of the maximum mark, three-fourths were absent not more than sixty times in the course of the year, or not more, on an average, than twice a week; while a considerable number of scholars of high grade took advantage to this extent of their freedom." By one of the Dean's tables it appears that the first ten, in point of scholarship, of the class were absent on an average twenty-four times. The rank of these

ten ranged from 98 to 92 per cent. of the maximum. The fourteenth and last ten, who obtained from 53 to 48 per cent. of the maximum, were absent on the average one hundred and twenty-four times—the total number of exercises to be attended by each senior being about three hundred and sixty. If the experiment of freeing the seniors from enforced attendance upon recitations stood unrelated to the general discipline of the college, one year's trial of it might not be considered decisive of the result, but it is not an isolated experiment; it marches with the policy of the college in making almost all the work after the freshman year elective, and it depends upon observations of the effect of elective studies upon the student which extend back a good many years beyond the present college administration, so that it may be supposed that the trial of 1874-75 has gone a good way towards making the new arrangement permanent. The friends of the change, whose number was revealed by the applause that accompanied Dr. Hedge's triennial address on "University Reform" in 1866, ought to feel gratified. There may occur some abuses of privilege; but the Faculty are not likely to allow the effect of an improvement in educational methods to be spoiled by a few idly disposed persons. Notwithstanding the negative result of one year's trial, we do not know why some advance in general scholarship may not be looked for eventually under the new arrangement.

—The Dean's report gives the number of students in the different classes attending different studies, but does not calculate the percentage of attendance in these studies. We have done this, as somewhat interesting in the present state of learning at the college. We find that in the three upper classes, reckoned as one, where these studies are not required, 32 per cent. elect Greek, 68 per cent. Latin, 41 German, 23 French, 9 Italian, 5 Spanish, 48 History, 25 Mathematics, 50 Physics, 23 Chemistry, 34 Natural History. From the Freshman Class, of which Greek, Latin, etc., are required, 2 in number took advanced Greek, 4 advanced Latin, 2 German, and 2 French. In the year 1875, French or German was required for the first time in the examination for admission. Of 318 examined, 294 presented French, and 24 German. Of those offering French, 41 per cent. failed in this requisition, and 21 per cent. of those offering German. In the year 1874-75, French was not taught in the freshman year, but was taught as a prescribed study to 89 sophomores out of 208. At the same time, German was a required study of the 195 freshmen. Philosophy, not including Political Economy, as the table does, was taken by 37 per cent. of the three upper classes. This includes 42 sophomores with whom Philosophy is not a required study. Philosophy, however, is a required study in the junior year, and was then taken in the prescribed exercises by 138 out of the class of 159. Political Economy is a required study in the sophomore year; advanced Political Economy was taken by 42 per cent. of the juniors and seniors. The 48 per cent. of students in advanced History (mediaeval and modern) included 51 sophomores, in which class History is also required. The 25 per cent. of advanced students in Mathematics does not include 15 freshmen who were associated with them. Of the 197 freshmen, 184 appear in "Mathematics, Class I," and 185 in "Class II." Advanced, in addition to prescribed, Physics was taken by two sophomores. Attendance upon lectures in Physics is required of all the juniors. Advanced Chemistry was taken by 1 freshman. Two freshmen also elected studies in natural history. Music was elected by 3 per cent. of the whole college; Fine Arts (principles of design in painting, etc.; history of the fine arts and their relation to literature) by 12 per cent. of the sophomores, juniors, and seniors. About 6 per cent. of the same elected English, including Anglo-Saxon, and the comparative grammar of the Teutonic languages. Exercises in Rhetoric with six themes were also required of all the sophomores; the same, with four forensics, of all the juniors; and four forensics (a noun not recognized by the dictionaries—the thing meant is a variety of theme) of all the seniors. Two seniors studied Hebrew, two seniors and one freshman Sanskrit. It is necessary to say further, in explanation of some of these figures, that for the past three years sophomores and juniors "have been at liberty to present themselves for examination in advance upon any of the prescribed studies of those years, and upon passing a satisfactory examination in any subject have been exempted from attendance at exercises in that subject, receiving their mark from the anticipatory examination." In 1874-75, of the 159 juniors 17 thus anticipated the prescribed Logic, 21 Psychology, and 88 Rhetoric; and of the 208 sophomores 104 prevented (to employ a convenient archaism) their prescribed Political Economy, 83 Constitutional History of the United States, 31 History, and 43 Physics. Of the 25 freshmen admitted at the last examination, 7 passed on the Latin of the freshman year, 8 on the Greek, 9 on the German, and 10 on the whole or a part of the Mathematics, and took in their room electives.

—Harvard College is now the only college in the country—at least, the only one of the leading colleges—which makes a full and complete and public annual report of its work and condition, a fact to which President Eliot in the document before us calls attention. Harvard has now for fifty years laid before the country this yearly statement of its affairs. Every college, great and small, in the country ought to do so, and we think it would not be amiss for the legislature to compel it to do so. The funds of the various colleges now form a sum of enormous amount, constituting a trust of the highest importance to the public welfare, and there is, therefore, every reason why those charged with its administration should render a periodical account of their stewardship. At present, many of the colleges—and some of the richest—carry on their work with far greater secrecy than if they were private money-making corporations. An annual report would not only do a great deal to abate or remove any popular hostility to their accumulation of property, which may before long show itself in an attempt to tax them, but would convey invaluable information, both to the officers of other colleges and to parents and guardians. It is not by way of casting any imputation upon any college in particular that we add that there is no body of men, however conscientious or able, which does not in the administration of a great public trust need both the stimulus and check which comes from the knowledge that they will have, at short intervals, to lay before the world an account of what they have been doing, their reasons for doing it, and the results.

—In the *American Law Review* for January is an article on German Legislation which illustrates that curious fancy for foreign follies that our over-modest American citizens are so apt to acquire when exposed to the baleful influence of benighted Europe. The author explains how the drafting of the laws is there done in the most elaborate manner by experts of the highest ability. The laws are not intended to be revised by the courts of law; and “they not only contain a brief statement of the special rule, but also set forth the principle on which it is founded, and by which it is to be construed.” The legislation “here described is not done in a hurry, and is meant to last. Certain laws have been years in preparation. In these cases the draft is printed and put in circulation, so as to obtain the weight of opinion long before it is put on its passage, or they are submitted to permanent committees. By these means a general and satisfactory understanding is apparently arrived at, so that at the end bills of great extent and importance are rapidly passed, not without opposition, but so as thus far to have saved the German legislature from that appearance of weakness and indecision which has been fatal to some parliamentary governments. . . . One has to confess to a new sensation at finding it [the law] prized for intelligibility, and at detecting no suspicion that it is not to be understood like other matters by the unaided human faculties.” Our readers will remember that Mr. Mill once suggested the application of skilled labor to law-making, by entrusting the formal shaping of statutes to professionals of high standing; but this has been regarded as one of those curious vagaries in which the soundest minds will sometimes indulge. He obviously did not know how we make laws in this country; and we turn with a sigh of relief from this foreign red-tape to our simpler system. Taking up the blue-books of one of the leading New England States, we find that in the last two years 816 laws, general and special, were enacted, and of these about two-thirds were private laws, most of which extended the powers of corporations. The remaining two hundred odd were all amendments of previous general statutes. Of the general laws passed in 1874, twenty-five (about one-sixth of the whole) were amended or repealed at the same session, and twenty-one at the next session, some of them being amended a number of times, so that these hundred and fifty laws have required some sixty alterations during a little more than a year from their passage. The general statutes of 1873 were fewer in number (less than 130) and the amendments now number 44. The general statutes of 1872 have been less leniently dealt with. Numbering about the same as those of 1873, they have already received 64 amendments. A little more than three years has elapsed and the amendments already number half as many as the original statutes of that year. It would be tedious to go over in such detail the legislation of previous years; but the reader will notice that the ten years, 1860–1870, doubled the bulk of the statute law of the State, and the next decade promises to be much richer. Some subjects have received an attention worthy of remark. Thus, the divorce laws have been amended nearly every year in the last fourteen, only five legislatures leaving them untouched; and amendments are now before the present Legislature. This subject is no doubt regarded as especially fit for the experimental methods of modern science, the fixity of domestic relations being of so little comparative importance. We hope the commonwealth of M—ts will send a set of its blue-books to the Centennial Exposition. It seems a pity

to lose so fine an opportunity of showing the effete and semi-barbarous tyrannies of Europe how to make laws.

—In the death of Mr. John Forster literature has suffered a considerable loss. His contributions to letters during the last forty years not only have been numerous and various, but distinguished by thoroughness of research, accuracy of statement, generous feeling, and masculine common-sense. He had a high estimate of the dignity of his calling, and though his literary style had little of splendor or of grace, it was that of a man who had made good English his study, and who had learned to express his thought in general with vigor and precision. His books are not works of genius, but they display a strongly-marked character, and secure for their author the respect of his readers. His ‘*Lives of the Statesmen of the Commonwealth*,’ and his more extended ‘*Life of Sir John Eliot*,’ have taken a secure place in the small library of English histories that will not need to be rewritten as time goes on and opinions change, while his *lives of Goldsmith, of Landor, and of Dickens* will always remain the chief and best sources of information concerning their respective subjects. His ‘*Life of Swift*,’ of which the first volume is but fresh from the press, must, it is to be feared, remain a fragment. He wrote it under conditions of depression and illness. It was the work, he said, of his “sick leisure,” but it shows no marks of feebleness or weariness. It is the fruit of long studies and of carefully accumulated material, and it gives proof of the same literary zeal, the same fidelity of research, the same painstaking and minute accuracy, and the same cultivated faculty of appreciation which are characteristic of his earlier productions. In reviewing his literary career, the fact is prominent of a prepossession in favor of biography, and the list of the lives he has written exhibits the breadth and variety of his sympathies. This was in truth the ruling characteristic of his nature and his life. It is strikingly illustrated by his having been the chosen biographer of men of genius so diverse, of temper so opposed, of lives so unlike, as Landor and Dickens; and Forster will be remembered hereafter not so much for his services to literature as for his friendships. To have been the chosen, lifelong friend of Landor, Dickens, Carlyle, and other men not unworthy to be classed with these, is the proof of a genius far rarer than any which wins mere literary celebrity. “The only way to have a friend is to be one,” says Mr. Emerson, and this was Forster’s prime quality. It is this which makes his death a deep personal loss to many persons known and unknown to the world. Mr. Forster was born at Newcastle in 1812. He studied for the bar, to which he was admitted, but his literary tastes soon withdrew him from the practice of the law, though he long retained his chambers in Lincoln’s Inn—pleasant chambers, always hospitably open, and a frequent meeting-place of the best spirits of the time. He was for many years editor of the *Examiner*, and made its influence felt in politics and in letters. He was a Liberal in politics; and, deeply interested in American institutions, he followed the course of contemporary history in America with unusual intelligence and appreciation. His knowledge of English literature was extensive and thorough, and he collected a library such as few men of letters have had at command. For a long period he was, first, Secretary to the Commissioners, and then one of the Commissioners in Lunacy, and he discharged the responsible and often laborious duties of his office with exemplary fidelity. He married comparatively late in life, and became possessed of ample means; but ease of outward circumstance did not abate his industry or diminish the activity of his cordial sympathies. His latest years were saddened by the death of friends and by the failure of health; but even in the depression of sorrow and illness the strong vitality of his nature displayed itself in the quickness of his interest in affairs and in his ready social animation. In personal intercourse, the sturdy traits of his character were conspicuous. He was thoroughly English in the build of his body and his mind. His dislikes were as hearty as his likes; his prejudices were often indulged to humorous extravagance. An impetuous and vehement manner covered or disclosed the almost womanly tenderness of his heart. His memory was excellently stored, and he used its stores easily. His talk came from a full mind. He knew his books, and his library became by degrees one of the best in its kind. The room was a delightful one, and the volumes on its crowded shelves were the true surrounding for one whom their authors would readily admit on even terms to spiritual companionship. Swift, Addison, Fielding, Smollett, Goldsmith, Johnson, seemed but little less familiar with him than their living successors; and now that he is dead, Forster, as he would have liked, has become to thought the contemporary of them all.

—Frédéric Lemaître, born a month before Déjazet and dying a month after her, had not, like her, preserved his powers unimpaired; he had long been little but a ruined relic of his former self. Perhaps the greatest of the

four great artists of the romantic period of the French drama, he had survived for years Boeage, Mlle. Georges, and Mme. Dorval. After playing in "Trente Ans, ou la Vie d'un Joueur" with Mme. Dorval, he created—and here the use of the French idiom is exact—"Robert Macaire," transmuting the cheap melodrama, of which he was one of the authors, into a colossal caricature almost Aristophanic in its grandiose buffoonery. Perfected by the wit of Philippon and the pencil of Daumier, "Robert Macaire" has remained a type. In 1835, after playing *Gennaro* in "Lucrece Borgia," and *Richard Darlington*, he visited England, where he was well received. It can hardly be doubted that his powerful but occasionally vulgar acting exerted a visible influence upon Dickens (then only beginning to be known as "Baz"), with whose nature his had much in common. Upon his return to France he appeared in "Kean," a piece of tawdry bombast by the elder Dumas, unworthy of criticism, but effectively contrived to show off the varied genius of the actor. To Edmund Kean, from whom the play borrowed only its name, the French critics frequently likened him. Gautier called him "the only actor who reminds us of Garrick, Kemble, Macready, and especially Kean"—a conjunction of names which must appear absurd to any one who knows the unlikeness to each other of the actors thus grouped together. Mr. Lewes says that to "speak of Lemaître as a rival of Kean or Rachel seems to me like comparing Eugène Sue with Victor Hugo—the gulf that separates prose from poetry yawns between them." M. Hugo himself thought otherwise; in the note appended to "Ruy Blas," in which Lemaître acted the hero, the author declares that "for the old, he is Lekain and Garrick in one; for us he has the action of Kean united to the emotion of Talma." He was often called "the Talma of the boulevards." It is related that, at the first reading of "Ruy Blas," Lemaître supposed that he was to play, not the hero, but *Don César de Bazan*, an incident which perhaps suggested to that skilful playwright the setting of *Don César* in a separate play of which Lemaître should be the protagonist. After this, his next important part was the *Chiffonier* of M. Félix Pyat. In Balzac's "Vautrin," his make-up to resemble Louis Philippe caused the suppression of the play. It is inaccurate to say—as it has been said since his death—that of late, or after his failure in "Les Saltimbanques" in 1892, he played no new parts; for in 1893 he acted the old schoolmaster in M. Barrière's "Crime de Faverne" with much of his old effect, if we are to believe M. Claretie ("La Vie Moderne au Théâtre," first series). Again, in 1870, he played in "Le Portier du No. 15." The well-known "Centenaire" was written for him, although he never acted it. In the last years of the Empire he received a small pension from the Government, and in the summer of 1873 a general benefit was arranged for him at the Opéra, which fell through, owing to the anonymous intermeddling of a composer and critic who would not allow the desecration of the stage of the national opera-house by the "Fille de Mme. Angot." Mr. Lewes, whose temperate opinion seems more just than the enthusiastic eulogies of the French, thought Frédéric Lemaître "singularly gifted" and of "exceptional genius," but he detected in him (as we lately had occasion to remark) "something offensive to good taste," "a note of vulgarity, partly owing to his daring animal spirits, but mainly owing, I suspect, to an innate vulgarity of nature."

—Encouraged apparently by the success of the excellent "International Scientific Series," the publisher, Reinwald of Paris (F. W. Christern, N. Y.), announces a "Bibliothèque des Sciences Contemporaines," of which two volumes, "La Biologie," by Ch. Letourneau, and "La Linguistique," by M. Hovelacque, have appeared. The prospectus contains a list of good subjects and names; but reading it makes one wonder after all whether the number of compendious repetitions of the same given material which the public really needs be not overestimated by publishers. The Biology of this series, for example, which we have received and read, is assuredly a skilful and learned compilation, well written, and not without original suggestions and expressions. But for whose use is it? For that of studious youth? of leisurely old with a taste for smattering and desultory dilettantship? or for busy middle-age in men of other sciences who, having no leisure to look at the details of biology, yet need to know its more general results and tendencies? Not for the use of youth assuredly, for the English fashion of popularizing science by describing in full detail a concrete instance or two, and knitting a few general results to this as a text, is far better for beginners than a book like this, where the whole treatment tends to the abstract, and where the breadth of the "laws" disguises the physiognomy of the instances. We incline to think that the best function of such a book as this (and, *mutatis mutandis*, of its fellows) is to give medical practitioners, and persons who have studied anatomy and physiology sufficiently to supply from their memory some concrete particulars to give body to the author's generalities, a notion of the way in which biological science is to-day

tending. But surely for these readers the need is not pressing, considering how many other manuals are within their reach; whilst for beginners in science the abstract-general-result method of exposition can only be regarded as a muddler of the imagination and an inspirer of conceit.

—Our objections to M. Hovelacque's book are not less decided, though of a somewhat different character. It has far too much of fact and too little of inference and reasoning for a manual of science. Of its 350 pages only about 50 are devoted to the discussion of general questions; and of the 50, a good part are wasted on the establishment of distinctions which would, with a better method, take care of themselves, or on what is worse. Nothing can show more strikingly the author's inaptitude for sound theorizing than his crusade against "etymology," which he declares to be the antithesis of linguistic science, the latter being the systematic historical study of a language and of its laws of development, as if these ends could possibly be reached in any other way than through etymology, the study of the history of words! M. Hovelacque would apparently have us get our principles and laws *à priori*. His general views, too, bear pretty clearly the marks of such an origin. His main authority is Schleicher, than whom a more untrustworthy guide in these matters could not well be found; and he adopts and puts nakedly forward, without any attempt to establish them or to refute the reasoning by which they have been repeatedly overthrown, such dogmas as that the study of language is a natural and not a historical science; that languages are born, grow, decay, and die, like all living creatures; that man became man by learning to talk, the faculty being the unique characteristic of humanity; and that languages have necessarily a variety of origins. In the purely descriptive work which constitutes the bulk of his volume, and which is, therefore, carried into far greater detail than in any other similar manual, M. Hovelacque is, of course, much more to be trusted, and a good deal may be learned from him if sought with some caution and independence of criticism. Yet here he does not always go to the best sources; for instance, for the American languages his authorities are the old ones, Pickering and Duponceau, with the modern addition of Friedrich Müller of Vienna—a man of great but very unequal merit, of too wide range and too great oddity of judgment to be safely followed. The Dravidian languages and the Basque are those which the volume before us treats most fully and with most originality. It rejects vehemently the "Turanian" family. It repels all idea of relationship between Indo-European and Semitic, but allows the connection of Semitic and Hamitic. As to the real character of Etruscan and of the "Accadian" of the cuneiform monuments, it expresses no decided opinion.

—In the hot theological controversies of the present day it is hard to treat any subject even remotely connected with ecclesiastical history without betraying a "tendency." This tendency is frankly avowed by August Werner, "Evangelisch-Protestantischer Pfarrer," in the very title of his "Bonifacius, der Apostel der Deutschen, und die Romanisirung von Mitteleuropa" (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel; New York: L. W. Schmidt.) He reminds his readers that twenty years ago, at the eleven-hundredth anniversary of the death of St. Boniface, all classes and creeds in Germany hastened to pay honor to this greatest of missionaries; but that Archbishop Ketteler, his successor in the see of Mentz, cast a chill over this generous enthusiasm by harshly chiding the German people for its heresies and predicting its speedy downfall as a nation. Mr. Werner has a sense of satisfaction, we may be sure, in quoting the prelate's words, and comparing them with the present order of things in Germany. For the rest, while admitting that his work is a contribution to the present religious controversy, he asserts for it a scientific basis, in studies and authorities. He has produced a really instructive and readable book, and has shown with great clearness and fulness the nature of the ecclesiastical claims of Rome and the results of the mission of Boniface. He is not one of those—and here we agree with him—who accept historical movements, even on so large a scale as this, as necessary and therefore salutary; he can regard the Romanizing of Germany as essentially only a calamity, from the effects of which the world has not yet recovered. The political bearings of Boniface's career are very well analyzed, and the character and policy of Charles Martel are admirably described; the secularizations of Pepin are, on the other hand, inadequately treated. The style is animated, but there is at times too much detail for common readers. There is a great lack of dates and, as it seems to us, of references; neither is the index a very good one.

—It is now about ten years since Domenico Berti's "Life of Giordano Bruno" threw a new and lurid light on one of the earlier tragedies which have marked the conflict between theology and science. The well-merited distinction which it conferred on the author has been maintained by a recent

work of even wider interest. On the fourth centenary birthday of Copernicus, Signor Berti pronounced a discourse in his honor, and this he has now published with considerable additions, including incited documents illustrating the struggle through which a paternal Church preserved the purity of the faith by sending Bruno to the stake and condemning Galileo to silence. The Copernican theory was the field on which was fought out the battle between intellectual slavery and freedom of thought, and no one can fully comprehend the vicissitudes of the momentous struggle without referring to the labors of Signor Berti. In addition to the main subjects of interest in the volume, the author has collected much material which illustrates graphically the social and intellectual condition of Italy during the Renaissance. For instance, one of the curious incidents of the revival of letters, amid the ignorance and corruption of the Church before the Reformation, was the spread of unbelief and paganism among the learned—unbelief which found its way into the Vatican itself. In sketching the university life of Copernicus at Bologna during the closing years of the fifteenth century, Berti gives us vigorous portraits of some of the notable teachers of that mother of learning. Among these is conspicuous Codro Ureco, the Professor of Greek, who carried his learned fanaticism so far that he was wont to declare that the gods would pass away and fall, but that Homer never would; and it is related of him that once he turned to an image of the Virgin and addressed it: "Hear, O Virgin, these words that I utter from the bottom of my heart, and with full self-knowledge! If on my death-bed I implore thy help, take me not to thee, for I have resolved to pass my eternal life with the infernal gods!" No one can fully understand the development of our modern civilization without taking account of all the currents of thought which have contributed to it, and among these the neo-paganism to which we have alluded is not the least important. During the period between the suppression of Hussitism and the rebellion of Luther, the Church was wonderfully tolerant. Secure in the possession of its temporalities, it cared little what men might think or say so long as its revenues and immunities were not threatened. Savonarola might disregard a Papal excommunication and proclaim the foulness of the Papal court with impunity, but when he crazily sought to league together the sovereigns of Christendom against Rome, his doom was sealed. The extraordinary spectacle of a teacher of youth in the renowned University of Bologna thus openly indulging in blasphemies is, therefore, only a sign of the times; and the contrast between this and the severities exercised against the upholders of the Copernican theory marks the changed attitude of the Church wrought by the dangers of the Reformation, when it had learned by experience that thoughts were as formidable as armies.

AN HISTORICAL DETECTIVE.*

MR. CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE was not a critic. His papers treat of Pope, Junius, and Burke, but they contain not a line which analyses the style or illustrates the thought of these three masters of the English language. He deals with historical personages, but he has no claim to the title of an historian. He does not narrate the events of as much as one year; he does not depict a single character; he does not propound any historical view or theory, and he exhibits an absolute incapacity for appreciating the character either of men or of ages. Nor, again, can Mr. Dilke be justly termed an antiquarian. He probably possessed a minute knowledge of certain periods, or at any rate of certain topics, but he was, to judge from his works, deficient in the capacity for profound or extended research. Mr. Dilke, nevertheless, was a genuine historical student, who did good service within a narrow field. He possessed faculties not of a high but certainly of a rare description. He worked, in short, at the kind of enquiries which excited his interest, much after the manner of an acute attorney who grudges no labor in getting up his case, and brought to the study of history the tastes, the faculties, and the method of one of those ingenious and successful detectives who are rarely to be found in a police station (for your ordinary policeman is a dull fellow who does not know his own business), but who abound in the pages of Dickens. Mr. Dilke could "mole" in his search for curious facts with the industry and success of Mr. Pancks. He noted down stray bits of information and pieced them together with the astuteness of Mr. Nadgett, and kept his eye upon "parties" who aroused his suspicion with the unwearied vigilance and sublime self-confidence of Inspector Bucket.

It was characteristic of his genius that he should choose as the main field of his labors the Junius controversy. It is still more characteristic

that in dealing with this topic Mr. Dilke should have taken up an almost entirely negative position. He ventures indeed on a conjecture of his own as to the identity of the great unknown with Mason, the friend of Walpole. But Mr. Dilke himself attaches no importance to his own hypothesis, and devotes to it not a tithe of the 227 pages in which he sifts the claims put forward in favor of various pretenders by different theorists. It is in exposing the errors of others that all Mr. Dilke's really considerable power is displayed. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that he looked upon every man who wrote upon Junius as an arrant humbug, who was certainly a fool and probably a knave. Mr. Dilke's eye was in a moment fixed on the offender; and Mr. Dilke's knowledge, industry, and acuteness were all brought into play to show that the man who was daring enough to think that he had solved the unsolvable literary enigma had proved nothing but his own incompetence and ignorance. Mr. Dilke, it must be admitted, did the work of exposure thoroughly well. He knew the details of his subject with the thoroughness of a skilful counsel who has studied all the ins and outs of a difficult brief. He had, further, thoroughly mastered the principle which many writers of greater pretensions have failed fully to appreciate, that no one should ever be content with second-hand evidence when original evidence is obtainable. Thus he shattered at one blow a whole mass of hypotheses by showing that the dates affixed to the private letters of Junius cannot be relied upon, since they depend in many cases merely on the conjecture of their first editor. So, again, he shows conclusively that a particular speech of Chatham's, which it has been assumed must have been heard by Junius, might have been known to him through a report which certainly appeared in some of the London papers. Some writer again asserts that the sale of the *Public Advertiser* rose immediately on the appearance of the celebrated letters. This assertion, which is credible enough in itself, seems to have passed entirely unquestioned till for some reason it roused the suspicion of Mr. Dilke, and he took the obvious but neglected precaution of examining the day-book of the newspaper. The result is rather curious. "Neither the first, nor the first dozen, nor the first two dozen letters had any effect whatever on the sale of the paper. Then, indeed, on the 19th December, 1769, came forth the letter to the king. This created an effect and an extraordinary demand. Dr. Good, who cannot be right even by accident, states that 500 copies of the *Advertiser* were printed in addition to the usual number, whereas the evidence before him—this day-book to which he might have referred—would have proved that 1,750 additional copies were printed." It may be said that these and like facts are not worth the labor with which they are ascertained. But Mr. Dilke clearly held that if men wrote about Junius at all they ought to write accurately, and the tenacity with which he clung to this belief is characteristic of the best side of his intellect and of his work. The characteristic expression, "who cannot be right even by accident," betrays an acerbity which rendered him not only a bitter but also a narrow-minded controversialist. As regards Junius and some other kindred topics, he was, no doubt, while he lived, "the scourge of impostors and terror of quacks." He has left no one, we fear, behind him who can deal with anything like the same thoroughness or severity with ignorant rogues who venture to think that the letters signed "C." are the work of the man who held up George III. and his ministers to immortal obloquy.

Mr. Dilke delighted in the detective's work of exposing imposture, and unfortunately his delight in this pursuit led him to confine his labors to topics in which the talents of a detective have full play. He writes about great men, but he never interests himself in the great side either of their work or of their character. Thus he devoted a great deal of attention and labor to the subject of Burke's biography. What is noteworthy is that the statesmanship, the oratory, and the political speculations of Edmund Burke possessed no interest for the mind of Mr. Dilke. He looked upon all the "Burkes" with intense suspicion. He noticed with truth that there is something mysterious, or at any rate not fully explained, about the early life and career of the man who rose from being the son of an unknown Irish attorney to a place in the foremost rank of English orators and politicians. Mr. Dilke seems to have been really harassed by the fact that it is not very easy to account for the steps by which Burke made his fortune. Here was an enigma worthy of his talents. What was Burke's parentage? What did his fortune amount to, and how did he get it? What was his religion? Was there any truth in the tale that he was once in America, or in the still more mysterious report that his brother was head of a Roman Catholic monastery? These and other enquiries like them, which amused the scandal-mongers of the last century, are the questions which occupied Mr. Dilke's really vigorous mind, and which he labored with indefatigable energy to answer. The results in this case scarcely repaid his labor. It would, however, be unfair to deny that he has contributed several facts to our knowledge of the early

* "The Papers of a Critic. Selected from the writings of the late Charles Wentworth Dilke. With a biographical sketch by his grandson, Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, Bart., M.P." London: John Murray.

career of Burke, and has suggested trains of enquiry which any future biographer will be bound to follow up. It is impossible after reading Mr. Dilke's pages not to suspect that the earlier years of the great statesman's career were probably not a period to which he himself looked back with satisfaction. The strange rumors as to the mode by which the estate which Edmund Burke inherited from his brother came into Garrett Burke's hands; the curious lawsuit of which Mr. Dilke ferreted out the authentic details; the fact, which he seems to have established, that Burke's connections suffered severely from losses in India stock, are, each and all, matters of which satisfactory explanations enough could perhaps be given if it were possible to recover the whole details of Burke's life; but they certainly give countenance to the idea that Burke, like other great men who have risen from obscurity, may have suffered more from pecuniary and other difficulties than those who knew only his later years may have conjectured. Mr. Dilke, however, considerably weakens the effect produced on his readers by his careful research through the display of an inordinate and almost insane tendency to suspicion. The suggestion that Burke may have been induced to write his diatribes against the French Revolution, in part at least, by the wish for a pension, is just one of those suggestions which would never have been made by a man of Mr. Dilke's ability unless he had become for the moment a dupe to his own passion for detection. He exerted so much vigor in hunting up the secret history of the "Burkes" that at last he came to look upon them in the same way that a policeman regards a gang whom he knows to be rogues and has not yet been able to bring to conviction.

The inherent defects of the detective's view of history become apparent enough to any one who reads carefully the 'Papers of a Critic.' The subjects investigated are in themselves not worth investigation. The question, for example, who wrote the letters of Junius is one of no more essential importance than the enquiry who was the man in the iron mask. It is scarcely conceivable that, could the author of the letters be ascertained, the knowledge of his name would throw any real light either on the history of the last century or on the character of any man of first-rate celebrity. The letters themselves will always have a certain importance, since they give expression to the fierce indignation aroused among the English people by the incompetence and corruption of statesmen who in a critical period were leading the nation to ruin; while to know the name of the writer who gave expression to this indignation would gratify a natural curiosity, it would add next to nothing to our knowledge of the last century. The private character of Burke is a matter of more consequence, yet even here it is easy to overrate the importance of knowing all the details of a great man's life. Could it even be proved that Burke was influenced in his view of the French Revolution by considerations of private interest, the merits and demerits of the "Letter to a Noble Lord" or "The Regicide Peace" would be neither lessened nor increased. What men like Mr. Dilke never can understand is that a great man lives in his works. Were every slander which malignity has suggested and credulity has swallowed established as truth, the thoughts of Burke would not lose their weight, nor his language be deprived of its eloquence. Another defect of Mr. Dilke's method of enquiry is that it is, to speak plainly, ignoble. Great men have their weaknesses and their vices, and it is well that their weaknesses and vices should be known; but the man who occupies his mind mainly in exploring the weak sides of heroic characters directs attention to exactly that portion of biography which is unworthy the permanent contemplation of liberal minds.

The defects of Mr. Dilke's treatment of history are patent. It is of some consequence that its less obvious but real worth should not be overlooked. Patient enquirers who search diligently for facts deserve some praise even though the facts for which they search may be of slight importance, and their mode of investigation may argue a certain defect in taste. Every period of history is apt to become gradually misunderstood through the growth of a mass of errors and misrepresentations. Every now and then a man of genius cuts down at one blow the crop of confusion which hides the character of an age or of a man from the eyes of later generations. But more generally errors are removed one by one through the careful research of men who combine insatiable curiosity with a delight in exposing mistakes. Their labors are not always dignified, but they are always useful. The detectives of history, like the detectives of the police office, hardly deserve or look for admiration, but they serve, though in a humble sphere, the cause of truth.

TWO MILITARY WORKS.*

GENERAL GORDON'S "Third Paper" is a handsome volume of 230 pages. The first and second papers were pamphlets, of like print and size of page, and told the story of the regiment, from its organization in the spring of 1861

* History of the Second Massachusetts Regiment of Infantry. Third Paper.

to February, 1862. The present continues the story through Banks's retreat from the Valley of the Shenandoah and his defeat at Cedar Mountain.

It would be well if the history of every regiment that saw actual service in our war could be written, but there were very few that deserved a permanent record so well as, and it is doubtful if there was one that deserved it better than the Second Massachusetts Infantry. Governor Andrew was at first extremely stiff in his recognition of the right of enlisted men to elect their officers, and was always extremely tenacious of his constitutional right of commissioning; but at the outbreak of the war such exceptional and powerful influences were brought to bear upon him that he yielded to the gentlemen who projected the formation of his second regiment the rare privilege of officering it as they saw fit. It was arranged that the colonelcy should be given to Gordon, the lieutenant-colonelcy to George L. Andrews, the majority to Wilder Dwight. Gordon was a graduate of West Point, and had seen service in the Mexican War, and had afterwards become a member of the Boston bar. He was a man of vigor and determination, a stern disciplinarian, self-confident, and unyielding, especially to his superiors; upon the whole, unusually well adapted to the task of turning into soldiers a mass of men drawn from a community accustomed for nearly half a century to the profoundest peace. Andrews had been the first soldier in his class at West Point, and had seen peaceful service in the Engineers. He was a man of the highest integrity, but a precisian, and trammelled by the qualities of his mind and of his training. Dwight, the prime mover in the formation of the regiment, was a young lawyer, of excellent standing and of brilliant promise. Well born, well educated, full of ardor, intelligence, and activity, he was rapidly making a name for himself, and was already honored with the friendship of such men as Judge Hoar and the present Chief-Justice Gray. The very best of the young men of Boston and its neighborhood sought eagerly for commissions in the regiment, and from them the whole list of officers was selected with great care. Men offered themselves with like alacrity, and the companies were rapidly filled with the cream of the real volunteers of Massachusetts. A fund of some thirty thousand dollars was raised by subscription for the uses of the regiment.

It would be a pleasant task to describe in detail the formation and career of this almost peerless organization, but the purpose of the present notice is less extensive. We must content ourselves with telling the reader what he may find in General Gordon's book. Those who know anything of the Second Massachusetts will turn to it with lively interest, and will not lay it down till they have read to the end; but they seem to us doomed to a good deal of disappointment. It is far too much a history of what General Gordon thought, said, and did. It contains a good deal of valuable information, but an excess of husk in proportion to the corn. It tells us altogether too little of the daily inner life of the regiment, of the processes by which its thousand men were changed from citizens into thoroughly-disciplined soldiers; of the constant application of intelligent force by which its high character was sustained amid all the trials of active service, and in spite of the dangerous influence of inferior discipline all around it. One looks in vain in it for such glowing tribute to the soldierly carriage of its men in action as Napier pays to the fusiliers at Albuera, and which is fairly expected of officers writing of their own soldiers, no matter how far inferior in literary ability and accomplishment they may be to the consummate historian of the Peninsular War. Especially is it strangely silent as to the merits of its gallant officers who lost their lives. Savage, Goodwin, Cary, Abbott, and Perkins fall almost unnoticed in the disastrous day of Cedar Mountain—a list of names whose death in one field will long make that day sadly memorable in the annals of Massachusetts. The book comes too near to being an autobiographical sketch. If it were only a private, regimental affair, its character would be a matter between the regiment and its author; but it is sold in the bookstores, and so it comes within the reach of general criticism. It is fair to add here that the fact that the book was prepared to be read by the author to his old comrades goes far to prove that its egotism must be unconscious.

Of the value of the book as bricks for the builder, it is not easy to speak without a really close study of it, because it leaves a confused impression upon the mind when it undertakes to describe the retreat of Banks from the Valley and the battle of Cedar Mountain, the only two affairs of importance in which the regiment was engaged before the battle of Antietam. The author tells us a great deal of what he did and said and saw and heard upon both of these occasions, but he so tells his story that we feel when we finish

Delivered by George H. Gordon, Major-General of Volunteers and Colonel Second Massachusetts Regiment of Infantry in the late War, at the Annual Meeting of the Second Massachusetts Infantry Association, on May 11, 1875. Boston, 1875.

* Reminiscences of Forts Sumter and Moultrie in 1860-61. By Abner Doubleday, Brevet Major-General United States Army. New York: Harper & Bros. 1876.

it as if we had a less clear idea of the operations than we had when we began. It is probable that, if he had been able to forget himself a little, he would have made his account more comprehensible; but as it is he leads us about with him, forward and back and right and left, until we feel ourselves compelled to stop for a moment and bring our minds to the fact that there must have been somewhere, in the Valley and at the base of Cedar Mountain, a Southern and a Northern line of battle, a right, a centre, and a left, a line of advance and a line of retreat. It is easy to find fault, and the mood of mind induced by disappointment may tend to turn the pen of the reviewer unduly in that direction. To guard against that possible error we will abandon adverse criticism, and seek in what more we have to say to do justice to the real merits of the book. And it may be declared with emphasis that it is really interesting and very entertaining. It is not only the work of a man of sense and intelligence and knowledge of his business, but of a man who was largely instrumental in forming the regiment of which he writes, and who was actually present with it in all the scenes which he describes. His command was never, during the period embraced in this volume, larger than a brigade, of which the Second Massachusetts formed a part, and so he was not far from his own men at any time. Whatever facts he states as of his own knowledge we accept as authentic. We give him not only the credit of meaning always to tell the truth, but of being very free from that tendency to brag which disgraces so many of the books on military affairs, and makes them so untrustworthy.

One thing of especial value in his book is the fearlessness and fulness with which he contributes material for the military history of General Banks. The Valley should have taught Banks that he was unfit to exercise military command, and Cedar Mountain should have enforced and completed the lesson, but unblushingly and callously he proceeded to the crowning disaster of Red River. If there was a man in our war around whose head the "ghosts of those who in battle were slain" should assemble, that man was General Banks. To his leaving undone those things which he ought to have done, and to his doing those things which he ought not to have done, in the Valley and at Cedar Mountain, General Gordon bears full and fitting testimony.

Our war was fought by volunteers, and it was the common lot of all the regiments to be short-lived. The Second Massachusetts' term of service was a little over four years. There is something deeply pathetic in the thought of a noble regiment ceasing to exist. In other lands, officers and men lay down their lives and their places are filled by promotion or enlistment, but still the regiment lives, and its traditions go on collecting perhaps from century to century. But to our volunteer regiments the day came soon when the last roll was called and the colors were wrapped around the staffs never again to be unfurled in battle, or surrounded by loving and loyal hearts. The place of the Second Massachusetts regiment is secure in the affectionate and proud admiration of all who knew it, and we are grateful for every printed word that shall make its high desert known to the reader in distant places and in coming days.

Gen. Doubleday was, in 1861, the captain of one of the two companies of artillery which were besieged in Fort Sumter; and in the little book named above he has undertaken to give his reminiscences of the daily events of the garrison life from the time Major Anderson came to take command at Fort Moultrie in November, 1860, to the evacuation of Fort Sumter on the 14th of April, 1861. Reminiscences of those exciting times are always interesting, and his are well told; but they would seem to bring forth two classes of important facts which it is safe to say were hitherto almost unknown: first, that Doubleday was a noted Abolitionist, and that the mob of Charleston was howling for his head; that the transfer from Moultrie to Sumter, and in fact every other successful move, was made upon his advice; and that the lost opportunities of asserting the Federal supremacy were the result of discarding that advice; secondly, that Major Anderson was at that time very wavering in his devotion to the Union. This last allegation Gen. Doubleday supports by certain remarks of Anderson—as, that he thanked God when told that no one in the rebel forts had been hurt during the bombardment, and afterward wrote that "his heart was never in this war"—and by the inaction which he maintained until actually fired upon. From the tone in which his accuser writes, one would suppose that Anderson's duty was as plain as the routine of a parade; and yet, by his own showing, four members of the Cabinet were in sympathy with the South, Horace Greeley had proclaimed the right of secession, Gen. Scott was in favor of "letting the wayward sisters go in peace," and Yancey was delivering secession speeches at the North without molestation. In such troublous times as these the duty of a simple major in the army in command of a fort near the hot-bed of secession was by no means clearly defined, and yet upon his action the gravest results depended. His position

became still more difficult when, on reporting the facts to Washington and asking for orders, he received nothing but indefinite replies. What, then, was he to do when he saw the preparations being made on all sides to reduce his fort? Was he to remain passive or to open fire on the new batteries?

The latter seems to have been Captain Doubleday's advice; but it was extremely fortunate for the country that it was not accepted, for it must be remembered that what fired the Northern heart was not altogether the question of secession or slavery, but the fact that a deliberate act of hostility had been committed in opening fire upon the United States flag; it might have been far different had Anderson fired the first shot and thrown the initiative on the North. And how could a major in the artillery take the responsibility of opening the war, when so many people clung to the idea that the whole matter might yet be settled amicably? Gen. Doubleday might have thought more carefully on these difficulties before he cast reflections on his commanding officer after his death. And not only are these reflections ungracious at this late day, but many of them are contradicted by the book itself. On p. 75 we learn that when Anderson found that Georgia would secede, "he seemed to lose all interest in the Union, and merely desired to become a spectator of the contest and not an actor. His efforts thenceforth were simply confined to making his fort secure against an assault. Hardly any amount of provocation could induce him to become the assailant." How could he become the assailant when, as we are told on p. 50, "Major Buell bore written orders, which were delivered on the 11th Dec., directing Major Anderson not to provoke hostilities, but in case of immediate danger to defend himself to the last extremity, and take any steps that might be necessary for that purpose"? These instructions were doubtless in Anderson's mind when, on the 9th of January, the *Star of the West* appeared and was turned back by the fire from Fort Moultrie. Doubleday had his men at the guns, "but Anderson would not allow us to return this fire"; and he was quite right, for he was in no immediate danger, and his instructions forbade him firing until he was. But that there might be no mistake in another case, an officer of the garrison was immediately sent to Washington with a report of the affair, and a request for specific instructions. He returned in ten days with the reply that the Administration "had the utmost confidence in Major Anderson, and left everything to his judgment."

It is difficult to see how in such a trying case, without precedent or instructions, an officer could have pursued a different course from that adopted by Major Anderson, namely, to remain passive until his fort was attacked, and then to defend himself as well as his small force and scanty supplies would allow; meanwhile, to leave politics to the Administration at Washington. Few officers have departed from this safe rule without coming to grief. As for Anderson's personal feelings, they have nothing to do with the matter, except so far as they influenced his conduct. He must be judged solely by his actions, and any reference to his private opinions—or, more properly, what Doubleday supposed to be his private opinions—is out of place. It is a pity that these ill-timed reflections occur so often as seriously to injure an otherwise very readable and interesting book.

THE WIFE OF JOHN ADAMS.*

WE welcome this volume as called for by the needs and the spirit of the times: on the one hand, by its faithful portrayal of a New England wife; on the other, by its illustration of the part which such a wife plays in the life of her husband. Abigail Smith was born in 1744 and died in 1818. Of these seventy-four years, fifty-five were passed in wedded life. She married a man who was fast rising into distinction in law, his profession, and who was to be still more distinguished in statesmanship, the profession of all true men of those days. Her education was such as home could give her; she never went to school. With such means, and none other, she was to pass through life with John Adams, partly leaning, partly leaned upon: softening the asperities of his temper by her gentle words, *ἀπαρὸς ἐπέεσσιν*, and strengthening his higher aspirations by her intelligent sympathy.

"You have this day," she wrote, when he had reached the summit of an American statesman's legitimate ambition, "to declare yourself head of a nation. And now, O Lord, my God, Thou hast made Thy servant ruler over the people. Give unto him an understanding heart, that he may know how to go out and come in before this great people; that he may discern between good and bad. For who is able to judge this Thy so great a people?" were the words of a royal sovereign, and not less applicable to him who is invested with the chief magistracy of a nation, though he wear not a crown nor the robes of royalty.

* *Familiar Letters of John Adams and his Wife, Abigail Adams, during the Revolution. With a Memoir of Mrs. Adams. By Charles Francis Adams.* New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1876. 1 vol. 12mo.

"My thoughts and my meditations are with you, though personally absent; and my petitions to heaven are that 'the things which make for peace may not be hidden from your eyes.' My feelings are not those of pride or ostentation upon the occasion. They are solemnized by a sense of the obligations, the important trusts, and numerous duties connected with it. That you may be enabled to discharge them with honor to yourself, with justice and impartiality to your country, and with satisfaction to this great people, shall be the daily prayer of your
A. A."

These are the words which make men ardent and resolute in duty, and firm and confident in trial. She had cheering words, also, when the occasion called for them. "I am a mortal enemy," she writes her husband, apparently in an anxious moment, "to anything but a cheerful countenance and a merry heart, which Solomon tells us does good like a medicine." What a glimpse of herself she gives us in these lines: "I have taken a very great fondness for reading Rollin's 'Ancient History' since you left me. I am determined to go through with it, if possible, in these my days of solitude. I find great pleasure and entertainment from it, and I have persuaded Johnny to read me a page or two every day, and hope he will, from his desire to oblige me, entertain a fondness for it." That Johnny, cooing history at his mother's knee, was the John Quincy Adams of after fame.

She applies her history, and quotes Polybius to enforce a practical lesson:

"Did ever kingdom or state regain its liberty when once it was invaded without bloodshed? I cannot think of it without horror. Yet we are told that all the misfortunes of Sparta were occasioned by their too great solicitude for present tranquillity, and from an excessive love of peace they neglected the means of making it sure and lasting. 'They ought to have reflected,' says Polybius, 'that as there is nothing more desirable or advantageous than peace, when founded in justice and honor, so there is nothing more shameful and, at the same time, more pernicious when attained by bad measures and purchased at the price of liberty.'"

John Adams is surprised by his wife's statesmanship: "Pray where do you get your maxims of state? They are very apropos." We might fill pages with passages like these, and see her still growing wiser and stronger under the discipline of events, while John Adams also unveils himself in this commerce of the heart. It is not probable that she ever expected to see her letters in print. But he had been too long before the public to be troubled by the thought of publicity; had taken too large a part in great affairs not to know that history is never more truthful than when made up of materials like these. "I write you this tittle-tattle, my dear," he writes her from York, July 2, 1774, "in confidence. You must keep these letters to yourself, and communicate them with great caution and reserve. I should advise you to put them up safe and preserve them. They may exhibit to our posterity a kind of picture of the manners, opinions, and principles of these times of perplexity, danger, and distress."

Here is one such picture:

"I believe I forgot to tell you one anecdote. When I first came to this house it was late in the afternoon, and I had ridden thirty-five miles at least. 'Madam,' said I to Mrs. Huston, 'is it lawful for a weary traveller to refresh himself with a dish of tea, provided it has been honorably smuggled, or paid no duties?' 'No, sir,' said she, 'we have renounced all tea in this place; but I'll make you coffee.' Accordingly, I have drunk coffee every afternoon since, and have borne it very well. Tea must be universally renounced, and I must be weaned, and the sooner the better."

Compare this as an expression of public opinion with the following, written the very next day:

"A notion prevails among all parties that it is politest and genteel to be on the side of administration; that the better sort, the wiser few, are on one side, and that the multitude, the vulgar, the herd, the rabble, the mob only, are on the other. So difficult is it for the frail, feeble mind of man to shake itself loose from all prejudice and habits."

Of Mrs. Adams's letters, that of November, 1775, is certainly one of the most remarkable:

"... Colonel Warren returned last week to Plymouth, so that I shall not hear anything from you until he goes back again, which will not be till the last of this month. He damped my spirits greatly by telling me that the Court had prolonged your stay another month. I was pleasing myself with the thought that you would soon be upon your return. It is in vain to repine. I hope the public will reap what I sacrifice."

"I wish I knew what mighty things were fabricating. If a form of government is to be established here, what one will be assumed? Will it be left to our assemblies to choose one? And will not many men have many minds? And shall we not run into dissensions among ourselves? I am more and more convinced that man is a dangerous creature, and that power, whether vested in many or a few, is ever grasping, and, like the grave, cries 'Give! give!' The great fish swallow up the small, and he who is most strenuous for the rights of the people, when vested with power is as eager after the prerogatives of government. You tell me of degrees of perfection to which human nature is capable of

arriving, and I believe it, but at the same time lament that our admiration should arise from the scarcity of the instances."

"The building up of a great empire, which was only hinted at by my correspondent, may now, I suppose, be realized even by the unbelievers. Yet will not ten thousand difficulties arise in the formation of it? The reins of government have been so long slackened that I fear the people will not quietly submit to those restraints which are necessary for the peace and security of the community. If we separate from Britain, what code of laws will be established? How shall we be governed so as to retain our liberties? Can any government be free which is not administered by general stated laws? Who shall frame these laws? Who will give them force and energy? It is true your resolutions, as a body, have hitherto had the force of laws; but will they continue to have it?"

"When I consider these things, and the prejudices of the people in favor of ancient customs and regulations, I feel anxious for the fate of our monarchy, or democracy, or whatever is to take place. I soon get lost in a labyrinth of perplexities; but, whatever occurs, may justice and righteousness be the stability of our times, and order arise out of confusion! Great difficulties may be surmounted by patience and perseverance."

"I believe I have tired you with politics. As to news, we have not any at all. I shudder at the approach of winter when I think I am to remain desolate. I must bid you good-night; 'tis late for me, who am much of an invalid. I was disappointed last week in receiving a packet by post and, upon unsealing it, finding only four newspapers. I think you are more cautious than you need be. All letters, I believe, have come safe to hand. I have sixteen from you, and wish I had as many more."

"Adieu.

Yours."

We would call particular attention, also, to the descriptions, so full of life and of graphic power, of the closing days of the siege of Boston, and the unconsciousness with which both husband and wife paint themselves for posterity. This volume takes its place by the side of the most valuable documents of our Revolutionary history.

THE JEWS IN ENGLAND.*

THE author of the book before us has undertaken to narrate the history of the Jews in England from their return to the British Isles in 1656 down to the present time. The history of the English Jews previous to their banishment in 1290 is but shortly treated in an introductory chapter. It is interesting to follow Mr. Picciotto in his records, and to be informed by him of the endeavors of Menasseh ben Israel for the revocation of the decree of banishment; of the establishment and growth of congregations and synagogues; of the rise of charitable and religious institutions; of the genealogy of many families now or formerly Jewish; of the achievements of eminent Israelites in mercantile, political, literary, and other fields; of the beginning of the reform movement among the English Jews, and so forth. It must also be admitted that the author has gleaned some new material, hitherto not generally known, from the archives of certain London congregations, so that these sketches somewhat enlarge our knowledge of this segment of history. But it is greatly to be regretted that he in no instance refers to his sources. The value of his statements would be very much enhanced, and the statements themselves would carry greater conviction, if they were sustained by references to documentary evidence, and if the reader were enabled to corroborate and verify, as far as possible, the authenticity of the facts narrated. No historian has a right to demand that his narrative be accepted *prima facie* as entitled to full credence, and particularly not an historian like Mr. Picciotto, who, with almost childlike credulity, and without the least attempt to make a critical sifting of his materials, records as true even the supposed miracles of a Falk Bael Shem, believed in by superstitious people in their time. In short, his sketches leave the impression of being an uncritical compilation of anecdotes and stories, accidentally found here and there, and loosely strung together. Moreover, a great many of the facts stated by him are very irrelevant, and of no sort of consequence. A narrative which thus lacks the unifying spirit of organism cannot be honored with the name of history.

One branch of Anglo-Jewish history Mr. Picciotto has almost totally neglected, or at least has treated in an unsatisfactory manner: we mean the legal status of the Jews in England at different periods. A most interesting chapter might have been written on the development and application of the laws concerning them. Can Jews be competent witnesses? Can they make bequests to synagogues and Jewish charities? How about their marriages and divorces? In all these aspects the English Law Reports are rich mines of information. The author, however, seems to have had but a dim idea of the valuable historical materials to be found in them if properly worked. Otherwise he would not have failed to set forth that, according to Lord Coke, Jews must be ex-

* Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History. By James Picciotto. London: Trübner & Co. 1875. Pp. xii., 420.

cluded as witnesses altogether, but that Lord Hale's views were a little milder, for he thought that a Jew might be admitted as a competent witness to prove a murder, etc. Even in comparatively recent times, as we learn from the Law Reports, there was a prevalence of narrow legal views in regard to the Jews; and it has happened in the present century that a court of chancery arbitrarily transferred a sum of money which had been bequeathed to found a synagogue to a founding hospital, because, in the eye of the law, a Jewish synagogue was considered an institution to foster superstition! As a curious point in English law, which had no parallel in the German or other Continental *Judenrecht*, it deserves to be mentioned that some privileges and rights from which the Jews were debarred for ages could not be purchased even by apostasy. Not till 1828 were baptized Jews received as freemen of the city of London. What changes in less than half a century! Since then two Jews have dispensed justice as Lord Mayors of London. On the other hand, it would have been not more than proper if the author had shown how far the science of Judaism was fostered by non-Jews in England. Hebrew, rabbinical, and kindred studies had been favorite ones for a long time, and as early as the seventeenth century we meet with the eminent Hebraists Selden, Lightfoot, Pococke, Hyde, etc. A grateful Israelite should not have failed to render acknowledgment and praise to these great scholars.

Regarding Jews in Dublin, Mr. Picciotto is unable, he says, to ascertain positively whether any Jew dwelt in Dublin in the middle of the last century. Here he might easily have been led astray by so great an authority as Leopold Löw, who, in his 'Graphische Alterthümer der Juden' (I., p. 34) twice alludes to the Rabbi Zebi Hirsh ben Ezriel as of Dublin, by a singular and not immediately obvious typographical error for Lublin. We should be glad if we could regard the many misspellings of names to which Mr. Picciotto treats us—e.g., *Netto* for *Nieto*, *Zivy* for *Zebi*, *Phaibul* for *Phoibos*, or *Phoebush*—also as printer's mistakes; but they are repeated too often to admit of such a supposition and such an excuse. To another point we may be allowed to call attention before we conclude. It used to be thought that the designation "Star Chamber," given to a certain court of law, was derived from the name of the apartment where the *Shtars* (the Hebrew documents of the Jews) were deposited for safe keeping. Our author adopts this etymology, but the erroneous character of it can hardly be questioned when we consider that, as we learn from Gregorovius's 'Geschichte der Stadt Rom,' there was also a *camera stellata* in the Vatican. While acknowledging the diligence and the good intentions of Mr. Picciotto, we must nevertheless assert that the historian of English Jews and English Judaism has not yet made his appearance.

A Course of Practical Instruction in Elementary Biology. By T. H. Huxley, LL.D., Sec. R.S., assisted by H. N. Martin, B.A., M.B., D.Sc. (New York: Macmillan & Co. 1875.)—The lack of a suitable series of elementary text-books on zoölogy, designed to lead the student step by step from the study of the simpler forms of animal life to the more complex, and calculated at the same time not merely to furnish what may be vaguely termed a descriptive survey of the animal kingdom, but to impart a clear and specific knowledge of the structure, physiology, and affinities of the various objects brought under observation, has been long felt by the scientific public. Professor Huxley's treatise is of an essentially practical but at the same time decidedly popular nature. Written in that familiar and vigorous style so characteristic of most of the author's writings, concise in statement and accurate in definition, it leaves little in the scope of the work to be desired. Though not sufficiently elementary in certain portions, and perhaps a little too abstruse in others, it is, on the whole, clear enough to be handled by any one pretending to but a slight knowledge of the first principles of the science. Taking the common yeast-plant (*torula*) and *protococcus*, as forms exemplifying the simplest stage of vegetable existence, and *amaba* as equally illustrative of the lowest type of animal organism, we follow the professor in a minute examination of the microscopic cell and cell-contents, observe their mode of growth, reproduction, and decay, and note the interesting changes which they undergo under the direct influence of heat and light, or through the action of chemical agents. From the investigation of these primitive particles of organized matter—matter which may be almost said to be leading a passive or rather mechanical existence—we proceed to the consideration of the more highly constituted moulds (*penicillium* and *mucor*), plants consisting of an aggregation of homogeneous cells, and which, though showing a true differentiation into organs, still bear a strong affinity to *torula*. *Chara* and the bracken fern (*pteris aquilina*) illustrate a bi-sexual mode of reproduction among the thallogens and acrogens respectively, while the bean affords a familiar example

of an exogenous phanogam. Appended to the brief but well-sifted descriptive text which forms the reading matter of the work is a course of instructions intended to carry the student through a series of microscopical researches into the anatomy and physiology of each subject, and which will, in the words of Professor Huxley, enable him "to know of his own knowledge the chief facts mentioned in the account of the animal or plant." The section devoted to zoölogy is treated in pretty much the same manner as that on botany. A number of well-known objects, easily obtainable in most localities (such as the fresh-water polyp, mussel, and frog), serve to typify some of the leading modifications of animal structure, and to represent at the same time the several principal classes into which the animal kingdom has been divided. Great space is allotted to the description of the frog, the details about that worthy subject occupying no less than one-third of the entire volume, or more than 100 pages.

What is especially noticeable in the character of the present work is the complete absence of anything approaching a tendency to speculative theorizing, a remarkable circumstance in view of the number of important questions with which the author's name has been prominently connected. In one instance only do we find an allusion that may be regarded as having any bearing on one or other of the great biological problems of the day—namely, under *bacteria*, where a direct refutation is given to the experiments frequently brought forward in support of the theory of spontaneous generation. Objection might be made to the summary and positive manner in which this interesting question is disposed of, but the author had already fully stated his views on that point in his presidential address before the British Association in 1870. In the chapter on the bean, we are surprised to find no mention of that fact of primary signification in vegetable morphology, the correlation of the different organs of the plant—in other words, the intimate relation which the various parts constituting the flower and fruit bear to the leaf.

It is unnecessary to add anything further in praise of this treatise. The want of illustrations only is to be regretted, as their presence, we are convinced, would add materially to the value of the work.

History of the Modern High German Language. [Geschichte der Neuhochoutschen Schriftsprache. Von Heinrich Rückert.] Vol. I. (Leipzig: Weigel. 1875.)—This work, like so much that is good in German, will remain, we fear, a torso. The author, professor at Breslau, was overtaken by death just before the opening of the present semester. Unless he has left his manuscript in a state that permits of posthumous editing, we shall have to content ourselves with volume one, which treats of the period prior to Luther. A second volume, according to the author's intent, was to treat of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; a third, of the eighteenth and present centuries. Should this first volume be indeed all that we are to receive, we have reason to regret exceedingly the author's sudden death, for a history of the Lutheran and of the Lessing-Goethean periods, as Rückert had conceived and elaborated them in his mind, would probably have started a new era in our study of the influences under which modern German came into being. The present volume indicates clearly the author's method of treatment. It was not his object to write a methodical grammar, nor even to sketch the mutations of German phonetics and inflection in their main features, as Schleicher has done in his 'Deutsche Sprache.' Rückert has rather undertaken to point out the political-historical, literary, and ethnographical influences that have helped to make the language. He takes up, we may say, what Schleicher has passed by. His work is a history of German culture in its relations to linguistics. Although written by a professed philologist and based upon a thorough knowledge of the principles and results of philological investigation, it is not a technical treatise, but a popular essay—popular in the legitimate sense—and may and should be read by every student of German. It is interesting; but for a certain slipperiness and complication of style, we might almost call it more than interesting. Without attempting to go into a detailed statement of its contents, we may say that we have never met with a juster appreciation of the literary significance of Charlemagne and Otfrid of Weissenburg, or a clearer statement of the character and functions of mediæval classic German (*Mittelhochdeutsch*). The chapters upon the fortunes of the language in the Merovingian period, and upon the great eastward reflux that re-Germanized Lusatia, Prussia, and Silesia under and after the Hohenstaufens, are also masterly. Part second, which treats of phonetics, vocabulary, and syntax at the dissolution of the mediæval system, will probably be less interesting to the general reader, and also more difficult, inasmuch as it presupposes some practical familiarity with mediæval grammar. Taken altogether, we commend Rückert's work as the companion-piece and complement to Schleicher's.

American Engravers and their Works. By W. S. Baker. (Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie. 1875. Pp. 184.)—The purpose of the compiler of this little volume has been to put into a convenient form such facts as he has been able to collect concerning American engravers and their works. His list contains the names of eighty-nine persons who have practised the art of engraving in this country in the course of the last and the present century. Most of them are known even by name only to such indefatigable collectors as Mr. Baker, and it cannot be said of any one of them that he has made a place for himself in the first ranks of the art. Mr. Baker admits in his preface that we can lay no claim to a national school of engraving, though "we can point with reasonable pride" to some plates that have been produced here. He attributes the lack of importance of American engraving to the fact that the artistic talent, which might have been directed to the higher ends of the art, has been, since the first quarter of this century, "completely engrossed in bank-note work." This is, however, but a partial explanation of the deficiency of first-rate work in engraving in this country. The conditions of American society and the temper and aims of our civilization have not been favorable to the arts, and are not likely speedily to become so. Mr. Baker's "reasonable pride" in American work leads him in his notices of special engravers to an estimate of their merits which does not err on the side of critical severity, or display a delicate critical discrimination. Thus, out of his list of eighty-nine, we find ten spoken of as "admirable," and a still larger number qualified as "excellent," which would indicate so remarkable a percentage of excellence that we might well wonder at the paucity of good works. Indeed, the truth is that not a single plate has been engraved in America that can stand comparison with contemporaneous work in Europe, and very few which deserve to be prized for the sake of their artistic worth.

Mr. Baker has done his work with care and with general accuracy, and has rendered a service to all those interested in the history of the arts.

The Early Coins of America, and the Laws governing their issue, comprising also Descriptions of the Washington Pieces, the Anglo-American Tokens, many pieces of unknown origin of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the first Patterns of the United States Mint. Profusely illustrated. By Sylvester S. Crosby. (Boston: Published by the author. 1875, 4to, pp. 381.)—With the publication of Parts 11 and 12 Mr. Crosby has completed his elaborate and thorough work on early American coins. The book gives proof of long and careful research, of unwearied pains, and of great accuracy. For the collector it must be an indispensable

manual, while to the general student of American history it affords many curious illustrations of the economical conditions of the colonies, as shown in prevalent theories of currency, in varying standards of value, and in numerous practices of trade. The general absence of artistic beauty in American productions is exhibited in the common ugliness of the coins. No one of them will be prized two thousand years hence for beauty such as makes the coins of Greece and her colonies still precious to the lovers of art. No woman will ever wear one set like a gem for her adornment. The plates in Mr. Crosby's book are suggestive, not so much of the superiority of modern culture as of its inferiority to that of the ancient world. The lack of beauty in common things is an absolute loss. Mr. Crosby's volume is very handsomely printed and amply illustrated. Its author seems to have relied mainly upon its merits to make it known, and we are glad to have the opportunity to bring it to the knowledge of our readers, and to commend it to all who desire information on the subjects which it treats.

* Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Adams (C. F.), <i>Memoirs of John Quincy Adams</i> . Vol. IX.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Altken (Cora K.), <i>Sonnets, Songs, and Stories</i>	(Hodder & Stoughton)
Benjamin Franklin: <i>Sein Leben</i> , swd.	(A. B. Auerbach)
<i>Coasts of the Mediterranean Sea</i> Part I.	(Washington)
Church Quarterly Review, October.	(Pott, Young & Co.) \$1 50
Charles (Emily T.), <i>Hawthorn Blossoms: Poetry</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Dix (W. G.), <i>American State and American Statesmen</i>	(Estes & Lauriat) 1 50
Finney (Rev. C. G.), <i>Memoirs of</i>	(A. S. Barnes & Co.) 2 00
<i>Financial Review, 1876</i>	(Wm. B. Dana & Co.)
Frothingham (O. B.), <i>Beliefs of the Unbelievers</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 00
Hawthorne (J.), <i>Saxon Studies</i>	(Jas. R. Osgood & Co.) 2 00
Harper's Monthly Magazine, 2 vols., 50, 51.	(Harper & Brothers)
" Bazar, Vol. VIII., 1875.	" "
" Weekly, Vol. XIX., 1875.	" "
Mind. Quarterly Review of Psychology and Philosophy. Jan.	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Morley (Susan), <i>Throstlethwaite: a Novel</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 50
Packard (A. S.), <i>Life Histories of Animals, including Man</i>	(Henry Holt & Co.) 2 50
Patterson (Minnie Ward), <i>Pebbles from Old Pathways: Poetry</i>	(Chicago)
Pomeroy (J. N.), <i>Remedies and Remedial Rights</i>	(Little, Brown & Co.)
Sotheran (C.), <i>Shelley as a Philosopher and Reformer</i>	(Charles P. Somerby) 1 25
Spencer (C. E.), <i>Rue, Thyme, and Myrtle: Poems and Songs</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Stiegel (C. W. E.), <i>A Hundred Years Ago and Other Poems</i>	(Lancaster)
The Workshop, January, 1876, swd.	(E. Steiger) 0 50
" The G. C." Round the Table. Notes on Cookery.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Yonge (Charlotte M.), <i>My Young Alcides</i>	(Macmillan & Co.) 1 75

Messrs. Henry Holt & Co. have nearly ready the *History of the United States, in Freeman's Historical Course, with maps by Gen. Francis A. Walker*; Dr. Brinton's new work on 'The Religious Sentiment'; a revised edition of his 'Myths of the New World' and 'Jonathan'; a new novel by C. C. Fraser-Tytler, author of 'Mistress Judith'; Taine's 'Ancien Régime'; 'Ersilia', by the author of 'My Little Lady'; and General Walker's exhaustive work on 'The Wages Question' will soon follow.

General Rules
FOR
PUNCTUATION
AND FOR THE
USE OF CAPITAL LETTERS.
By PROF. A. S. HILL,
OF HARVARD COLLEGE.
NEW EDITION. REVISED AND ENLARGED.
WITH ILLUSTRATIVE EXTRACTS.
Sent by mail on receipt of 25 cents, by the Publisher,
CHARLES W. SEVER,
UNIVERSITY BOOKSTORE, Cambridge, Mass.

TREASURE TROVE. Cloth, 278 pp. An Illustrated Poem. Price \$2 25. Sent free on receipt of price. E. L. FREEMAN & CO., Publishers, Central Falls, R. I.

BRYANT & STRATTON Business Arithmetic.

Revised Edition. 1 vol. 8vo, \$2 50.

"A new and revised edition of a work rich in information for the student, accountant, and business man."—*Publishers' Weekly*.

"The various processes of the counting-room, banking-house, or stock-exchange; insurance, general average, equation of accounts, partnership settlements; in brief, everything connected with trade, wholesale or retail, is carefully explained."—*New York World*.

ALBERT MASON, Publisher,
13 Astor Place, New York.

F. W. CHRISTERN,
FOREIGN BOOKSELLER AND IMPORTER,
77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.
Large assortments of the publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Lévy Frères, etc., on hand; also complete lists of Tauchnitz's Collection of British Authors, and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. All European periodicals received weekly in parcels.

Zell's Encyclopædia.
NEW REVISED EDITION. Agents Wanted.
150,000 articles, 3,000 engravings, and 18 splendid maps. The best book of universal knowledge in the language. Now in course of publication. Specimen with map sent for 20 cts.
BAKER, DAVIS & CO., Philadelphia.

FOR any Book Desired or Information respecting Prices and Editions, address LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., Boston, Mass., who will promptly reply. Books carefully forwarded, post-paid, on receipt of advertised price. Send for catalogue of our own publications.

F. W. DEVOE & CO., Manufacturers and Importers of Artists' Materials.

Wax-Flower Goods, Varnishes, White Lead,
French Zinc and Colors.

115 and 117 Fulton Street, New York.

B. F. STEVENS, AMERICAN
Library and Literary Agent, 4 Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, London, England, supplies books and Periodicals of every sort by mail or express at lowest London prices. Full particulars of terms and mode of remitting United States currency are given in his priced List of English Newspapers and Magazines, which may be had free on application to him direct in London, or to his Custom-House Brokers, Messrs. Rice & Lynch, 31½ Pine Street, New York.

School Material:
Kindergarten Material:

Furniture, Stationery, Apparatus, Blackboards, and Liquid Slating. Catalogue sent free.
F. W. MARTINI & CO., 112 William Street, New York.

Interlinear Classics:
LATIN AND GREEK.
Circulars Free. Illustrated descriptive Catalogues of all our publications sent for 5-cent stamp.
CHARLES DE SILVER & SONS,
Philadelphia, Pa.

BOOKBUYERS will find their orders executed with intelligence and promptness by GEO. E. STEVENS & CO., Booksellers, Cincinnati, O. Letters of enquiry as to prices, etc., are invited. Any books will be carefully forwarded on receipt of their advertised price.

